

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In January of 2001 the Montana State Library (MSL) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to evaluate the current MSL long-range plan, which includes activities funded both by the State of Montana and with Federal dollars provided through the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA). The RFP identified the purposes of the evaluation as being:

- ◆ To assess to what degree MSL has met the objectives established by the 5-year agency plan;
- ◆ to provide information that is useful to Congress, the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the Montana Governor's office, the Montana State Legislature, the MSL Commission, MSL staff, and Montana's library community;
- ◆ to meet the IMLS reporting requirement for the first 5-year LSTA plan; and,
- ◆ to provide information that will inform the development of the next state plan.

The Montana LSTA Advisory Committee reviewed the proposals that were received in response to the RFP and subsequently recommended to the Montana Library Commission that Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants be selected to conduct the evaluation. The Commission subsequently approved the recommendation and the evaluation process began in earnest in March of 2001.

Over the past four months, the consultants have talked to well over 100 people in focus groups and in personal interviews. Participants included Montana State Library staff; library directors, staff, and trustees from libraries throughout the State; and over a dozen users of MSL services. Additional insights were gained from many more individuals through mail and web-based surveys. The consultants also reviewed reams of documentation related to MSL services and LSTA-funded grant initiatives and projects.

The result of these efforts is the following document which provides an evaluation of the Montana State Library's

management of the Library Services and Technology Act program, an evaluation of MSL's operation as a whole, and individual assessments of individual departments and programs.

Findings

The consultants gathered and analyzed an enormous quantity of information from many sources in the course of carrying out this study. An analysis of the information reveals a great deal about the organization. While the Montana State Library, like any complex business or government enterprise, is imperfect, the consultants believe that MSL is an outstanding organization. The people of Montana and the libraries of the State are well served by a competent, dedicated staff and by a talented and well-respected State Librarian.

Several specific factors impressed us greatly in the course of conducting our study. First, the Montana library community respects and trusts the state library agency. This in itself is no mean task. Over and over again, the consultants encountered librarians who praised MSL staff from the State Librarian on down through the ranks.

The State Librarian's communication skills were lauded, as was her willingness to listen to all sides of an argument before making a decision. The consultants heard nothing that indicated that the State Library avoids making the hard decisions. Even critics of specific decisions said they believed that they had received a fair hearing and that the State Library, and particularly the State Librarian, always attempts to act in the best interest of libraries across the State.

Furthermore, the library community believes that MSL is headed in the right direction. Many comments included phrases such as, "so much better than it used to be" or, "it's improved greatly over the last four or five years."

Montana's implementation of the LSTA program has been managed responsibly and in a fashion that is highly regarded by librarians in the field. The State Library has demonstrated its willingness to listen and respond to its

constituents with quality programs and initiatives that are relevant and well executed.

The Montana State Library has been active in restructuring departments and services in the recent past. The Library Development Department, the Library and Information Services Department, and the Natural Resource Information System are all quite different today than they were two years ago.

The consultants paid special attention to these reorganization efforts. In each case, the restructuring appears to make good sense. However, change itself is traumatic and adjusting to change takes time. There are some signs that the reorganized units have not quite managed to become coordinated teams. Nevertheless, some real progress can be documented and it would appear that the restructured units will emerge as stronger, more effective units.

Does the Montana State Library have shortcomings? Of course it does. No organization as diverse and as complex as MSL is perfect. However, we believe that this report will demonstrate that the Montana State Library is a dynamic and vital agency that serves the citizens of Montana well.

Following is a list of the recommendations that appear in this report. They are organized in a single section here for the sake of convenience. However, it is important that the recommendations be considered in context. Therefore, a careful reading of the entire report, including the appendices, is suggested before specific conclusions are drawn or actions are taken.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1:

The Montana State Library should strive to develop a unified plan that includes goals and objectives for all of its departments and services.

Recommendation 2:

MSL should continue to monitor connectivity in Montana Libraries and should consider ways in which LSTA dollars can be used to ensure that all public libraries have dedicated, high-speed Internet connections.

Recommendation 3:

MSL should attempt to demonstrate the value of MLN programs to small libraries. This may include new MLN initiatives or a refocusing of current initiatives to make them more attractive for small libraries to participate.

Recommendation 4:

MSL should continue its outstanding efforts to provide continuing education to librarians and should look for ways to:

- a. address the continuing education needs of library trustees, and,**
- b. use technology to deliver more continuing education to librarians and trustees in their libraries and/or regions.**

Recommendation 5:

MSL should consider including (and funding) a public awareness component in each new initiative that has a direct impact on current and potential library users. Indiana's effort to promote the INSPIRE program may be a model worth considering.

Recommendation 6:

MSL should continue to use LSTA funds to encourage the discussion of important issues facing libraries by convening study committees, task forces, and conferences. Massachusetts' "Public Library Initiative" may be a model worth considering.

Recommendation 7:

MSL should explore the possibility of using LSTA to support the development of appropriate library and information services in State institutions.

Recommendation 8:

MSL should explore the possibility of encouraging partnerships between public and school libraries through LSTA support for multitype activities sponsored by the library federations.

Recommendation 9:

MSL should consider using LSTA funds to support a public awareness campaign using the model discussed in Recommendation 5.

Recommendation 10: MSL should work toward securing State funded positions to carry out the basic operations of the Talking Book Library as described in the ASCLA/NLS guidelines.

Recommendation 11:

MSL should attempt to demonstrate the value of MLN programs to small libraries. This may include new MLN initiatives or a refocusing of current initiatives to make them more attractive for small libraries to participate.

Recommendation 12:

MSL should consider the long-term expansion of its online database program and should seek State funds to pay for actual license fees. LSTA funds for training, technical support, and public awareness should be used as a leveraging tool to secure State Legislative support for the program.

Recommendation 13:

MSL should continue to invest LSTA dollars in digitization projects such as the Montanaiana re-grant program.

Recommendation 14:

MSL should attempt to clarify the future role of MLN and should plan its funding strategies according to its determination.

Recommendation 15:

MSL should attempt to improve the mechanisms it uses to share information about the LSTA program with the library community.

Recommendation 16:

MSL should use the opportunity presented by the need to develop a new five-year plan to unify the agency.

Recommendation 17:

MSL should examine all staff positions and should attempt to develop a strategy to gradually secure State funding to meet ongoing operational needs.

Recommendation 18:

The new five-year plan should include the provision for tracking outcomes as well as performance data. The Florida Division of Library and Information Services (Florida's state library agency) has developed an outcome-based evaluation model that could be adopted by MSL.

Recommendation 19:

MSL should attempt to integrate new and emerging program goals into agency goals whenever possible.

Recommendation 20:

MSL should build a "public awareness" component into the planning process it uses to develop the next five-year plan. MSL should also use their planning process as an opportunity to "model" desirable behavior; i.e., librarians should recognize that they can apply some of the processes used to develop the State Library plan in their libraries.

Recommendation 21:

Whenever possible, MSL should employ robust strategies to accomplish its goals.

Recommendation 22:

MSL should attempt to preserve MLN's role as the state agency's Research and Development unit.

Recommendation 23:

MSL should nurture closer ties between MLN staff and Natural Resource Information System staff.

Recommendation 24:

LISD should further clarify the department's relationship with various types of users.

Recommendation 25:

LISD should work closely with NRIS and with other departmental/agency libraries in Montana State government to further define their respective roles and ways in which they can complement each other in providing excellent service to state employees.

Recommendation 26:

LISD should further clarify and enhance its role in collecting, organizing, preserving, and disseminating state documents.

BACKGROUND

In January of 2001 the Montana State Library (MSL) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to evaluate the current MSL long-range plan, which includes activities funded both by the State of Montana and with Federal dollars provided through the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA). The RFP identified the purposes of the evaluation as being:

- ◆ To assess to what degree MSL has met the objectives established by the 5-year agency plan;
- ◆ to provide information that is useful to Congress, the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the Montana Governor's office, the Montana State Legislature, the MSL Commission, MSL staff, and Montana's library community;
- ◆ to meet the IMLS reporting requirement for the first 5-year LSTA plan; and,
- ◆ to provide information that will inform the development of the next state plan.

The evaluation is, in some ways, premature in that the plan covers the five-year period through Fiscal Year (FY) 2002, which ends September 30, 2002. However, a combination of two factors makes evaluation of the MSL plan at the present time sensible. First, IMLS is requiring that states submit an evaluation of the LSTA programs in the Spring of 2002. Second, initial reviews of the plan conducted by MSL staff and the MSL Commission indicate that most goals of the 1998-2002 plan have already been achieved. It appears to be the ideal time to evaluate MSL's past performance and to move toward the development of the next five-year plan.

Methodology

The RFP for the evaluation project outlined some of the methodologies to be used in the assessment process in some detail. For example, it required that focus group sessions with members of the Montana library community be held in six geographically distributed locations around the State. The RFP also called for focus groups with Talking Book Library (TBL) users and it suggested that surveys could be used to solicit information from the plan's stakeholders.

Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants submitted a proposal for conducting the evaluation that included these and several other methodologies for gathering the information needed. The Montana LSTA Advisory Committee reviewed the proposals that were received in response to the RFP and subsequently recommended to the Montana Library Commission that Himmel & Wilson be selected to conduct the evaluation.

The Himmel & Wilson proposal included the required focus groups and surveys and supplemented these methodologies with a detailed review of background documents, focus groups with MSL staff at the departmental level, interviews with MSL supervisory staff, and interviews with selected members of the library community.

After a contract was awarded, the consultants began to work with a committee made up of the State Librarian, the Program Managers of the Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) and Statewide Library Resources, Departmental Supervisors, and the Federal Grants Consultant to refine the evaluation process and to establish a definite timetable for completion of the various tasks. The consultants conducted a telephone conference call with representatives of MSL on April 9, 2001 and requested copies of some background documentation. Dates, times, and locations for the general and Talking Book Library user focus groups were discussed in this phone conversation as well.

Subsequent telephone calls and e-mail contacts enabled the consultants and MSL staff to establish a schedule of events that included staff focus groups and interviews, TBL user and general library community focus groups, an opportunity to review additional documentation on site, and an opportunity to tour MSL facilities.

Dr. Ethel Himmel and Mr. William Wilson made their first site visit to Montana between May 3 and May 11, 2001. The consultants toured MSL departments, met with staff and administration in Helena, and conducted focus group discussions with staff members in each of the MSL departments. During this time period focus group discussions were also held with two groups of users of the

TBL, one in Helena and one in Billings, and with librarians and trustees in six locations throughout Montana: Billings, Butte, Great Falls, Miles City, Missoula, and Wolf Point. The majority of twenty-two individual interviews were also carried out during this time. Some interviews were conducted face to face, while others were done on the telephone. One consultant also reviewed the files and documentation kept by the Federal Grants Consultant concerning the "re-grants" made during the evaluation period.

Following preliminary analysis of the data gathered through the focus groups and interviews, the consultants developed three surveys. These surveys (one for school librarians/media specialists, another for academic, special, and institutional librarians, and a third for public librarians), offered individuals an opportunity to express their opinions regarding issues that were raised in the focus group sessions and in individual interviews.

Because the school year was about to end, the surveys targeting school and academic library staff were conducted as "web surveys." These surveys were mounted on the consultants' web-site and were promoted via the Montana Library Association's "Wired-Montana" listserv. The survey for public librarians was mailed to public library directors although public librarians also had an option of completing the survey electronically.

All three surveys explored the same issues and topics, but were modified where necessary to fit the situation of the specific type of library. The surveys generated an outstanding response. One hundred and sixty-one members of the Montana library community submitted completed surveys.

During July, 2001, the consultants compiled the survey results, conducted a further analysis of focus group and interview notes and continued their review of relevant documents. The result of these efforts is the report which follows.

Organization of the Report

Because this report is intended to satisfy the IMLS requirement for an evaluation of Montana's implementation

of the LSTA program, the first section of the report deals with this aspect of MSL's performance. However, it should be noted that both State and Federal funds have been used in pursuit of the same goals. Progress toward most of the goals contained in the plan would have been severely hampered if either source of funding had been reduced.

The second section of the report addresses the Montana State Library's progress both in general and at the individual departments and program level, i.e., the Library Development Department (LDD), the Talking Book Library (TBL), the Library and Information Services Department (LISD), the Natural Resource Information System (NRIS), and the Montana Library Network (MLN) initiatives.

The findings and recommendations contained in the report are based on the information collected through the various information and data gathering efforts. Detailed information about each of these efforts can be found in the extensive appendices that follow the body of the report.

APPENDIX A provides a summary of the six focus groups conducted with members of the library community in May, 2001. APPENDIX B contains a summary of interviews conducted with library community members in May and June of this year. APPENDIX C offers an extensive analysis of the three surveys that were conducted in June. APPENDIX D provides information gathered through a focus group and interviews with the Library Development Department staff. APPENDIX E summarizes the information gathered in focus groups and interviews with Talking Book Library users. APPENDIX F includes information gleaned from a focus group and interviews with TBL staff. APPENDIX G covers the focus group and interview sessions held with Library and Information Services personnel and several LISD users. Finally, APPENDIX H offers input from the Natural Resource Information System staff through a focus group and interviews.

While the body of the report stands on its own, the richness of the detail contained in the appendices should not be ignored. The details reveal a great deal about an outstanding organization. While the Montana State Library, like all organizations, is imperfect, the consultants

believe that MSL is an outstanding organization. The people of Montana and the libraries of the State are well served by a competent, dedicated staff and by a talented and well-respected State Librarian.

THE MONTANA STATE LIBRARY PLAN

The performance of the Montana State Library is measured throughout this report against the goals that it established for itself which are contained in the State Library's Long-Range Plan. The plan itself is an unusual document in that it includes both broad development goals that reflect considerable external input and somewhat narrow program goals that were developed internally for specific departments within the State Library. The result is a somewhat disjointed document that ranges in content from the Library Development Department's broad Goal 2 which states:

"Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format."

to the Library and Information Services Department's very specific "Preferred Future Statement" Seven which says:

"State employees use the department's website and their email software to register, request loans, photocopies, current awareness services, literature searches, document retrieval, and to schedule training or consulting services."

While each individual portion of the plan includes excellent content, the plan consists of a series of separate plans instead of as a singular document designed to provide guidance for a unified department.

The genesis of this unusual plan sheds some light on its structure. The Library Development Department component grows out of a statewide effort to gather input from a wide cross-section of stakeholders. The plans for the Natural Resource Information System and the Library and Information Services Department are the results of recent reorganization efforts in those units of the State Library.

It can be argued that the plan is right for the present time; that is, it provides considerable detail in service units that are still in the process of developing their organizational character. However, the consultants would be remiss if they did not mention the irregular nature of the plan itself.

Focus groups with librarians revealed some uncertainty about the respective roles of various departments with MSL. Again, recent changes, particularly in LISD can account for some of this lack of clarity. However, even within the agency, some NRIS and LISD staff seem a bit unclear as to how the two entities, both of which provide information to end users, can complement each other.

Further confusing the issue is the fact that while MLN is technically a program rather than a department, it has its own set of goals that are related to, but separate from those of the Library Development Department which is its organizational home.

The Montana State Library's Vision Statement, which is printed below, does manage to encompass the entire spectrum of MSL services. It serves to unify the disparate parts of the agency. However, the development of a unified agency plan for the next five-year cycle should be a high priority.

Montana State Library Vision

- ◆ Montana citizens have equal and easy access to quality library services without restriction or censorship or the violation of privacy. Every citizen depends on, values, and supports continued and enhanced library services. In Montana, library workers receive respect and recognition for their skills and abilities.
- ◆ Montana's libraries are integral components of their communities and design library services by consulting citizens to understand community needs. The library staff and the governing officials promote library services in all settings. Each community supports its library through sufficient tax support or institutional appropriations.

- ◆ Libraries cooperate with other libraries and organizations to strengthen services by sharing material resources and professional expertise. Each library accepts a role in improving library services on the state, regional, and national level.

Recommendation 1:

The Montana State Library should strive to develop a unified plan that includes goals and objectives for all of its departments and services.

EVALUATION OF MONTANA'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY ACT (LSTA)

Overview

Compared to most states, Montana's share of Federal LSTA support is relatively meager. While somewhat over \$ 700,000 is available each year under the program, this allocation pales in comparison to funding available to most much smaller states with far denser populations. Montana's geographic expanse and sparse population in many areas of the state presents real challenges in using Federal aid effectively.

The Montana State Library Commission has chosen to use the available LSTA funds in a way that they believe maximizes their impact on the State as a whole. In recent years this has resulted in channeling most of the money into initiatives and efforts that are likely to have statewide and/or regional impacts rather than distributing the majority of the money to local libraries through numerous competitive and/or non-competitive grants.

Examples of recent expenditures include work toward a statewide online union catalog, a weeklong statewide "Summer Institute" for training directors of small libraries, subsidizing the costs of regional shared catalogs, and funding regionally-based technology consultants to provide technical support to libraries.

Funds have also been used to pay for statewide library development effort by supporting consultants working from the State Library in Helena and to underwrite the cost of providing direct library services to institutionalized individuals and to persons with disabilities that prevent them from using standard print materials.

In focus group discussions and interviews, members of the Montana library community generally supported this focus on statewide and regional services. One participant commented that the MSL should “not be so dependent on Federal dollars,” and added that there were current programs, specifically the regional technology consultants, that should be funded by state dollars.

There were others who wanted more funding put into specific program areas, such as professional development and training for librarians or more to be spent on “people things” and less to be spent on technology. Nevertheless, the consultants heard little that would lead them to believe that there was much support for increasing the amount spent on “re-grant” or individual competitive or non-competitive categories.

Nor was any support voiced for withdrawing funds from the support of Library Development consultant positions or from Talking Book Library services. One person said, “Keeping most of the Federal funds at the State Library (for statewide and regional initiatives) isn’t a bad solution for the present.” They went on to say, “If they sent the Federal money all out to libraries, each library wouldn’t be able to purchase much.” A few people expressed support for innovative projects, but again, usually not at the expense of current programs and initiatives. Finally, a few people continued to mourn the loss of Federal funds for library construction that were available under the old Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA).

The Montana Long Range Plan for 1998-2002 states, “The (State Advisory) Council recommended that the State Library use 1998 LSTA funds to support certain State Library Programs, such as the Talking Books Library, to hire technology consultants, and to provide funds and assistance to public libraries that are not connected to the Internet.” Further, the Long Range Plan contains broad directions for the use of LSTA funds until the year 2002

and says that, "the Library Commission will further define these broad directions with recommendations from the Advisory Council and the Networking Task Force."

The Montana library community demonstrates that it has a high degree of trust in the Library Commission and in the State Librarian to use Federal funds responsibly to the maximum benefit of Montana residents. In order to maintain this high level of trust, the Commission will need to make sure that the voices of the library community continue to be heard. The recent dissolution of the Library Services Advisory Council was mentioned by only a handful of librarians. Only one person expressed disagreement with the decision to do away with that body. However, it is important to note that the Council did provide a mechanism for gaining input from the field on decisions related to LSTA. The Commission needs to ensure that the process used to develop the next five-year LSTA plan provides ample opportunity for broad input.

Applicable Goals

Three sets of Goals relate directly to MSL's implementation of LSTA. They are the goals of:

- ◆ the Library Development Department (LDD)
- ◆ the Talking Book Library (TBL), and,
- ◆ the Montana Library Network (MLN).

LSTA funding is used to support some staff in each of the three program areas. In two of the instances, LDD and MLN, staff also administer other LSTA programs and initiatives. For example, LDD manages the Summer Institute program while MLN manages the statewide online union catalog project. LSTA support for the Talking Book Library is different in that it represents direct support to a provider of services to end users.

We will address each of the applicable goals in turn.

Library Development Department

Library Development Department - Goal 1

All Montana citizens have direct access to information through telecommunications at their libraries.

The Montana State Library began working on this goal under LSCA funding and has continued its efforts to make sure that every library has access to online resources through the Internet. Participants in focus groups and staff in the Library Development Department felt that MSL had done a good job of working toward the accomplishment of this goal. Many representatives of small libraries who attended focus group sessions indicated that some libraries still would not have Internet access if LSTA funds had not been used to underwrite initial equipment and connection costs. LSTA funding for connectivity was provided in several phases through a non-competitive grant process. Libraries serving certain population ranges were invited to apply for the grants. The equipment that was supplied and the type of telecommunication connection funded depended on the population served.

While Goal 1 has essentially been accomplished, some libraries have dial-up access to the Internet only. In some instances this is due to a lack of advanced communications services in portions of the State. In other libraries, cost for high speed dedicated connections is the issue. MSL needs to be vigilant to ensure that online access is maintained and/or improved in all public libraries and in all areas of the State.

Perhaps the most popular LSTA funded initiative, the "Statewide Technology Consultants Project," is related to this goal. Three technology consultant positions provide regional technology assistance to libraries from sites distributed across the State. One consultant is stationed in Billings, another in Great Falls, and a third in Helena. Each position services libraries in two of the State's six library federations.

Participants in focus groups praised the quality of the consultants and the fact that MSL placed two of these positions outside the State Capital. While one of the positions is currently vacant, the technology consultants have played a critical role in trouble-shooting, training,

technical support, and just plain hand-holding. Many library staff members, particularly those in small libraries, think that these positions are critical to the ongoing health of technology-based services in small libraries.

Recommendation 2:

MSL should continue to monitor connectivity in Montana Libraries and should consider ways in which LSTA dollars can be used to ensure that all public libraries have dedicated, high-speed Internet connections.

Library Development Department - Goal 2

Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format.

Much of this resource sharing goal is being address by the Montana Library Network. In fact, MLN is, in large part, about this goal. For example, the largest single allocation of LSTA dollars in FY 2000 was for the statewide online union catalog project (\$ 170,316).

There is a certain amount of disagreement in the State in regard to the MLN initiative including the statewide catalog and the related shared catalog programs. Some librarians expressed the opinion that the eventual benefits of these projects are not worth the cost. One person said, "We don't need a statewide catalog to tell us that there aren't many resources in Montana." Others voiced concerns that ongoing costs would make programs like the statewide catalog and the shared catalogs unsustainable.

Participants in one focus group were quite vocal about the State Library not understanding their funding situation. However, when Library Development staff members were asked what complaints the consultants might hear in the focus groups, they offered that, "they'll probably say that we don't get it when it comes to local library budgets." One consultant went on to bemoan the fact that some directors in small libraries have to provide their own janitorial services.

It is clear that the LSTA dollars invested in MLN have accomplished several things. Through the efforts of MLN, many more library catalogs are now web-accessible.

Furthermore, MLN initiatives have moved the State toward adherence with important national standards. Nevertheless, MSL needs to listen to the voices of the directors of some small libraries who believe that participation in a shared catalog is unrealistic given budget realities.

The Montanaiana re-grant initiative (also a subprogram of MLN) also fits under this goal. In addition to being a success in terms of making valuable digital resources available to all, this grant category has also been effective in engaging different types of libraries. For example, grants were awarded to the Mansfield Library at the University of Montana and to the Yellowstone Art Museum during the FY 2000 grant cycle.

Recommendation 3:

MSL should attempt to demonstrate the value of MLN programs to small libraries. This may include new MLN initiatives or a refocusing of current initiatives to make them more attractive for small libraries to participate.

Library Development Department - Goal 3

Montana citizens are served by librarians and trustees who are knowledgeable about all aspects of library service.

The Montana State Library was ranked in the public library survey as the most important provider of continuing education. In the focus groups, librarians from throughout the State praised the Montana State Library for its involvement in continuing education for librarianship, especially through the Summer Institute program. Both the Summer Institute program and the Fall Workshop program have been supported with LSTA. Furthermore, Library Development Department staff, paid with LSTA funds, has been responsible for most of the planning and implementation of these types of projects.

On the negative side, focus group participants seemed to think that trustee training was largely lacking. The Library Development staff also recognized this as a weakness. They were hopeful that the recently released trustee handbook would have a positive impact; however, they, like the librarians in the field, recognized that effective

trustee training usually requires that it be delivered close to home.

One trustee who participated in a focus group pointed out that trustees felt like they were "out of the loop." While some librarians indicated that MLA's Wired-Montana listserv was their "lifeline," the trustee said that all the legislative information went to the directors on Wired Montana and said that he, as a trustee without Internet access at home, was forced to get his information second hand.

Recommendation 4:

MSL should continue its outstanding efforts to provide continuing education to librarians and should look for ways to:

- a. address the continuing education needs of library trustees, and,**
- b. use technology to deliver more continuing education to librarians and trustees in their libraries and/or regions.**

Library Development Department - Goal 4

Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries.

Some of MSL's continuing education efforts have addressed public awareness and building local support for libraries. However, both staff and members of the library community saw plenty of room for improvement on this goal.

Library development staff generally agreed with this assessment. One MSL staff member said, "I'd give us a D on Goal 4... that's up from an F but we still have a long way to go."

The Montana State Library has used LSTA funds to support two "Library Improvement Projects." These projects, while primarily aimed at encouraging larger units of service (county libraries) do provide heightened visibility for the libraries involved. Residents of the areas served by these libraries also have an opportunity to experience a higher level of service than they have enjoyed in the past.

While the results of these projects have been mixed to date, the use of LSTA to demonstrate enhanced library services is in keeping with calls for assistance in developing higher levels of local support for library services. Public library survey respondents rated "increasing public awareness of libraries" at 4.42 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 representing "most important."

A number of focus group attendees offered suggestions for publicizing library services. A number of states *have* used LSTA funds to support public awareness campaigns. Indiana has used LSTA money to fund publicity for their statewide full-text database program known as INSPIRE.

Recommendation 5:

MSL should consider including (and funding) a public awareness component in each new initiative that has a direct impact on current and potential library users. Indiana's effort to promote the INSPIRE program may be a model worth considering.

Library Development Department - Goal 5

MSL, with federations and local library agencies, will provide leadership to assure that Montana citizens receive excellent library services.

There are clear indications that the Montana State Library has expanded its leadership role in working for excellence in library service. "Legislative advocacy" and "securing direct state aid for local libraries" topped the list of roles for the State Library in the public library survey.

The State Library has also played an important role in facilitating discussion of important issues and in convening committees and task forces to address special concerns. LSTA support has been provided to support the work of the "Networking Task Force." The importance of the State Library's role as convener should not be underestimated.

Recommendation 6:

MSL should continue to use LSTA funds to encourage the discussion of important issues facing libraries by convening study committees, task forces, and

conferences. Massachusetts' "Public Library Initiative" may be a model worth considering.

Library Development Department - Goal 6

All Montana citizens have access to library services.

As was noted above, LSTA dollars have been used to support the Montana Talking Book Library and to provide library services to individuals residing in a variety of institutional settings.

The support for services to institutions has generally been through contracts with public libraries located in close proximity to the institutions. The Library Services Advisory Council studied the issue of institutional services and recommended that MSL should no longer support direct services with LSTA funds. The reasoning for this recommendation was that LSTA support could be seen as an excuse for not developing appropriate library and information services within the institutions. Instead of direct support, the Council recommended that the State Library work with the appropriate agencies to encourage the development of library services within the institutions.

It would appear that LSTA will continue to play a role in supporting the TBL but that MSL may wish to refocus the way in which LSTA dollars are spent for institutional services from actually *providing* services to *supporting the development* of appropriate services internally.

Recommendation 7:

MSL should explore the possibility of using LSTA to support the development of appropriate library and information services in State institutions.

Library Development Department - Goal 7

Montana's students are served by school libraries that meet state standards.

This goal is perhaps the most controversial. Reaction from the library community ranged from "It's a joke" to "That's OPI's (Office of Public Instruction) job." Library development staff also graded themselves poorly on their performance in regard to this goal.

Nevertheless, it was apparent from contact with school library/media specialists through the focus groups, interviews, and the school library/media center survey that the Montana State Library *has* managed to open up the lines of communications with the school library community.

School librarians and media specialists feel largely abandoned by the Office of Public Instruction. The fact that MSL is involving them in continuing education activities, Montana Library Network initiatives, and even in this study of MSL is seen as very positive by the school library community.

MSL has made attempts to work with the Montana Library Association to urge OPI to hire a school library consultant. This has not happened to date; however, it would appear that continuing efforts in this direction are warranted.

Another potential avenue of encouraging partnerships between and among public and school libraries is through the regional library federations. LSTA support for multi-type activities sponsored through the federations may serve to further this goal as well.

Recommendation 8:
MSL should explore the possibility of encouraging partnerships between public and school libraries through LSTA support for multitype activities sponsored by the library federations.

Talking Book Library

Talking Book Library Goals

The Talking Book Library Goals will be discussed in detail in the section that specifically looks at this department. What follows here are comments regarding the goals that seem to be most connected to the LSTA program.

Talking Book Library Goal 1:
Staff, volunteers and patrons will work in a safe, comfortable, and efficient working environment.

Although there are some space related issues in the TBL, there does not appear to be any direct relationship to LSTA funding.

Talking Book Library Goal 2:

Montana residents will receive the best possible service from the Talking Book Library.

Although users of the Talking Book Service indicate a high degree of satisfaction with TBL services, it would appear that TBL is not reaching a high percentage of eligible users.

Recommendation 9:

MSL should consider using LSTA funds to support a public awareness campaign using the model discussed in Recommendation 5.

Talking Book Library - Goal 3

There will be sufficient funding and staff to offer the best possible patron service.

Current users of the Talking Book Service indicate that they are well served by the TBL. However, it would appear that TBL may be too highly dependent on LSTA and volunteer assistance. The Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA) and the National Library Service (NLS) provide guidelines for staffing regional libraries for the blind and physically handicapped. The ASCLA/NLS guidelines also provide guidance in the types of services volunteers should be expected to provide.

The Talking Book Library staff would be unable to continue providing its high level of service if there was a considerable increase in the number of users. The Montana State Library should begin working toward securing state funding for the basic positions called for in the ASCLA/NLS guidelines in anticipation of efforts to increase the user base of TBL.

Recommendation 10: MSL should work toward securing State funded positions to carry out the basic operations of the Talking Book Library as described in the ASCLA/NLS guidelines.

Montana Library Network

Montana Library Network Goals

As was indicated earlier, the Montana Library Network is a program rather than a department of the State library. In fact, most of MLN's activities fit nicely under the Library Development Department's Goals, which is appropriate since MLN's organizational home is LDD. There has already been some discussion of MLN under the LDD section above. However, because of the high level of LSTA support received by this program, it is appropriate to review MLN's program goals. It should be noted that MLN's Goals grow out of the hard work of the Networking Task Force.

A number of focus group participants commented on the fact that MLN's goals aren't expressed in what is typically thought of as goals. Rather, they describe desired products or services. MLN should review its goals for clarity and should work to further integrate its goals into the larger State Plan.

Montana Library Network - Goal 1 Statewide Online Union Catalog

Montana Library Network - Goal 2 Resource Sharing System

Montana Library Network -Goal 3 Regional, Standards-Based Online Catalogs

The three projects listed above have received considerable LSTA funding. While many librarians throughout the State praised the vision of MLN and applauded MSL for taking on such a large effort, some people expressed the opinion that long-term costs and benefits have not been analyzed in great enough detail.

Continued support from the field for these projects will depend on demonstrating the value of the projects, especially to smaller libraries. The consultants believe that the MSL *is* heading in the right direction with MLN. However, more work needs to be done to determine ways

in which small libraries can feel involved in MLN initiatives.

The recommendation made above in relation to the Library Development Department's Goal 2 is repeated below.

Recommendation 11:

MSL should attempt to demonstrate the value of MLN programs to small libraries. This may include new MLN initiatives or a refocusing of current initiatives to make them more attractive for small libraries to participate.

Montana Library Network - Goal 4

Statewide fixed-rate OCLC membership

LSTA dollars to MLN indirectly provide limited administrative support for this program; however, providing a mechanism for libraries to secure high-quality bibliographic records is important to the success of the programs mentioned above that do receive LSTA support.

Many participants in the focus groups and many individuals interviewed applauded the OCLC fixed-rate contract negotiated by the MSL. The greatest concern expressed is that the contract may represent an unrealistic "come-on" deal and that long-term costs may not be affordable for small libraries.

Montana Library Network - Goal 5

Online Databases

LSTA dollars are not directly involved in this program either; however, many other states have used LSTA funds to help support the licensing of full-text online databases. The consultants believe that the Indiana INSPIRE program is a model. State funds are used to pay for database licensing fees and LSTA dollars have been used to provide training, technical support and public awareness efforts.

Recommendation 12:

MSL should consider the long-term expansion of its online database program and should seek State funds to pay for actual license fees. LSTA funds for training, technical support, and public awareness should be used

as a leveraging tool to secure State Legislative support for the program.

**Montana Library Network - Goal 6
Standards-Based Networked Library Resources**

This is perhaps more of a guiding principle than a goal; however, encouraging libraries to adhere to current and emerging standards will go a long way toward ensuring the ability of libraries to share their resources.

**Montana Library Network - Goal 7
Montanaiana**

The development of digitization efforts is growing across the nation. The Montanaiana project, while not highly lauded by the library community at this point, should prove to be increasingly important as additional Montana-specific resources become available.

**Recommendation 13:
MSL should continue to invest LSTA dollars in digitization projects such as the Montanaiana re-grant program.**

**Montana Library Network - Goal 8
Authentication and Authorization**

This goal was criticized by the library community as being cryptic and unintelligible. While the concepts of authentication and authorization are very important to many of MLN's valuable projects, this goal is indicative of one of the problems that MLN has encountered. The MSL staff who work on MLN initiatives have a wonderful vision for using technology to expand library and information services. Greater effort needs to go into making the vision understandable to the librarians of the State.

**Montana Library Network - Goal 9
Administrative and Support Services**

LSTA support for MLN administrative costs has been and will continue to be legitimate. However, the Montana State Library needs to determine what is in store for MLN in the

future. If it is intended as an entity to initiate new projects and to introduce new technologies, then continuing LSTA support for administrative costs is appropriate. If MLN is going to become a library automation utility that operates systems, then seeking State funding for at least some of its operations is advisable.

Recommendation 14:

MSL should attempt to clarify the future role of MLN and should plan its funding strategies according to its determination.

Administration of the LSTA Program in Montana

A review of documentation related to Montana's implementation of the LSTA program was quite satisfactory. Background materials, financial data, and reports on past and current projects were all well organized and easily accessible. MSL staff involved with LSTA-funded initiatives were well-informed and provided the consultants with a considerable amount of information.

Perhaps the greatest criticism that might be offered of Montana's administration of LSTA is that not enough information has been made available to the general library community on how LSTA funds are distributed. For example, in sharp contrast to some other states, very little information about LSTA is available on the MSL web-site.

Recommendation 15:

MSL should attempt to improve the mechanisms it uses to share information about the LSTA program with the library community.

ASSESSMENT OF THE MONTANA STATE LIBRARY

Overview

The Montana State Library is a complex organization. This is not true of all state library agencies. Some state library agencies exist primarily to fulfill the "library development" function and do not provide library and information services to state government employees or to the general public. In other

states, the Library of Congress/National Library Service "talking book" program is contracted out to another library, or, in one instance, to a private contractor. Montana's Natural Resource Information System is unique both as an organization and as a feature of the Montana State Library.

In addition to being complex, MSL is a diverse organization. A brief consideration of the different services that are impacted by MSL in an average day is instructive.

- ◆ A state employee secures information from LISD that may impact policy decisions
- ◆ A businessman in a small community uses a library computer to connect to the Internet through the only dedicated high-speed connection in the County
- ◆ A professor at the University of Montana turns to NRIS to gather information for a research project on water quality
- ◆ A public librarian in a small community in eastern Montana receives technical assistance from a regional technology consultant to keep the public access computers online
- ◆ An elderly retiree in a remote community in central Montana receives a new supply of "talking book" mystery novels
- ◆ A student in northern Montana finds the materials he needs to complete a research paper through an online database
- ◆ An historian doing biographical research accesses digital photos of historic figures in Montana history

This list could go on and on. The point is that the incredibly diverse work of the Montana State Library, much of which is invisible to the general public, has a tremendous impact on the lives of thousands of Montanans each day.

The Montana State Library also faces some notable challenges in providing its services. The size of the geographic area served, the sparseness of population in some areas, great disparities in local funding for libraries and the fiscally conservative nature of the State all contribute to formidable task facing MSL.

Himmel & Wilson has completed projects for more than a dozen state library agencies in the United States over the past five years. We have also completed several studies that have compared state agencies in all fifty states. Consequently, we feel we are qualified to offer an educated opinion of the Montana State Library's performance. The consultants believe that the Montana State Library offers the people of Montana a great value for every tax dollar invested in MSL's operation. Based on our experience, MSL does more with fewer resources than any other state library agency with which we are familiar.

Several specific factors impressed us greatly in the course of conducting our study. First, the Montana library community respects and trusts the state library agency. This in itself is no mean task. Over and over again, the consultants encountered librarians who praised MSL staff from the State Librarian on down through the ranks. The technology consultants, talking book library readers' advisors, and many more individuals were singled out for acclaim. Several people commented on the high visibility of the State Librarian saying things like "we never saw a State Librarian in our library before Karen came along."

The State Librarian's communication skills were also lauded, as was her willingness to listen to all sides of an argument before making a decision. The consultants heard nothing that indicated that the State Librarian avoids making the hard decisions. Even critics of specific decisions said they believed that they had received a fair hearing and that the State Librarian always attempts to act in the best interest of libraries across the State.

Furthermore, the library community believes that MSL is headed in the right direction. Many comments included phrases such as, "so much better than it used to be" or, "it's improved greatly over the last four or five years."

The Montana State Library has been active in restructuring departments and services in the recent past. The Library Development Department, the Library and Information Services Department, and the Natural Resource Information System are all quite different today than they were two years ago.

The consultants paid special attention to these reorganization efforts. In each case, the restructuring seems to make sense. However, change is traumatic and takes time. In all three cases there are some signs that the reorganized units have not quite managed to become coordinated teams. Interviews and focus groups within the units revealed that the departmental units are still in the process of becoming what they eventually will be.

Does the Montana State Library have shortcomings? Of course it does. No organization as diverse and as complex as MSL is perfect. Perhaps our greatest criticism of the Montana State Library relates to its diverse nature. Most of the component parts of MSL act as separate, isolated entities rather than part of a larger organization. This separateness is clearly seen in the very different planning documents that together make up the MSL Long-Range Plan.

As was mentioned earlier, part of the reason that the plan seems disjointed is that most units within MSL have been reorganized partially or completely in the recent past. As was also mentioned above, the newly redesigned entities are still in the process of becoming coherent units. Nevertheless, the consultants believe that creating a sense of unity and helping employees in one part of the agency understand what their colleagues in other areas do should be a priority.

The process of developing the next five-year plan provides a perfect opportunity for forging a unified vision for the MSL. Involving staff from all departments and program areas in the agency in the planning process is essential.

Recommendation 16:

MSL should use the opportunity presented by the need to develop a new five-year plan to unify the agency.

A second criticism of the agency is its dependence on LSTA funding to support some fairly basic operations. While it is not unusual for a state library agency to support consulting positions or Talking Book Library operations with Federal funds, the hallmark of the most successful state library agencies is their ability to capture State funding for important ongoing functions. MSL should not look at this criticism as a scathing indictment. The

Montana State Library Commission has merely acted in what it believes is the best interest of library service in the State in allocating a significant portion of LSTA funding to cover staffing costs. Furthermore, the State Library has repeatedly sought State funding for staff positions; most recently for the regional technology consultant position. The point is not that the actions that the Commission has taken are wrong. The point is that securing State funding for basic, ongoing services will free up LSTA dollars for important, innovative projects and initiatives that will result in improved library service. The Montana State Library needs to continue its efforts to secure State funding to cover basic operational staff expenses.

Recommendation 17:

MSL should examine all staff positions and should attempt to develop a strategy to gradually secure State funding to meet ongoing operational needs.

Library Development Department (LDD)

A fairly detailed discussion of the Library Development Department's performance was included in the section of the report dealing with the Library Services and Technology Act. This look at the Department differs from the first in that it focuses more on LDD as an organization rather than LDD as a service provider. It attempts to identify internal barriers that stand in the way of achieving the stated goals and it makes recommendations aimed at strengthening and increasing the capacity of the department to serve the library community.

Library Development Department Goals

The Library Development Department's Goals were developed in 1996 with considerable input from the library community. The State Advisory Council, which included six library users, also reviewed and commented on a draft of the plan.

This portion of the MSL Long-Range Plan is perhaps the most conventional in its organization in that it includes the typical goal, objective, and activity structure.

With the exception of Goal 5, the Plan states its goals in terms of users. It essentially describes what the citizens of Montana will get if the Library Development Department was completely successful in achieving the goals.

In these ways, the Library Development Plan should be considered as the model that should be used in creating a new plan for the entire organization.

The LDD plan includes a section entitled "Relationships with Libraries and other Organizations" that actually covers the entire state library agency. It reads as follows:

Relationships with Libraries and Other Organizations

MSL has distinct relationships with and levels of responsibilities to different types of libraries.

State Government - The MSL supplies work-related library and information services to state employees. MSL coordinates its services with the library programs of other state agencies.

Federations - The MSL Commission administers the state appropriations for Federations, establishes rules for their operations, and evaluates their programs.

Public Libraries - The MSL is responsible, along with local boards, for the development of local public library services. These responsibilities include voluntary certification of public library personnel, direct state aid to public libraries, the administration of LSTA funds, consulting, and providing continuing education opportunities. The MSL also provides back-up reference services and interlibrary loan services to public libraries.

School Library Media Centers (SLMC) - The MSL recognizes that the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) and the Board of Public Education have the responsibility for establishing and enforcing accreditation standards for SLMCs and for providing state level funding for SLMCs. The MSL also believes that the OPI has the primary responsibility for encouraging SLMC development.

However, the position of education media supervisor in the Office of Public Instruction has not been funded during the last few years.

Therefore, besides our responsibility to include SLMCs in multitype resource sharing programs, the MSL will attempt to support school libraries, as resources allow, including offering interlibrary loan, reference, and continuing education. The MSL will encourage OPI to resume providing for the needs of SLMCs.

University and College Libraries - The MSL welcomes the participation of post-secondary libraries in cooperative networks, resource sharing, and continuing education programs.

State Institutional Libraries - The MSL recognizes that these libraries serve Montana citizens who have special needs for library services. The MSL supports these libraries by offering consulting assistance and encourages their participation in cooperative networks, resource sharing, and continuing education programs.

Special Libraries - The MSL encourages the participation of special libraries in MSL networking, resource sharing, and continuing education programs. The resources of special libraries are important to serve the information needs of Montana citizens.

While this section of the plan probably needs to be updated, the approach of considering the entire spectrum of stakeholders in the plan and attempting to define relationships with the stakeholders is an excellent planning practice.

Library Development Department - Goal 1

All Montana citizens have direct access to information through telecommunications at their libraries.

As was suggested in the LSTA Evaluation section, LDD has managed to achieve most of their objectives under this goal. LSTA funds played a key role in bringing numerous libraries into the Internet Age.

New programs, such as the regional technology consultants, which were not envisioned in 1996, enabled LDD to move forward. This demonstrates another strength of LDD's performance. The LDD staff were not bound by the Plan's objectives and activities. Some activities were discarded and some objectives were adjusted.

LDD also tracked baseline and performance data through the course of the implementation. This helped the staff determine how they were doing in their pursuit of the goals.

Recommendation 18:

The new five-year plan should include the provision for tracking outcomes as well as performance data. The Florida Division of Library and Information Services (Florida's state library agency) has developed an outcome-based evaluation model that could be adopted by MSL.

Library Development Department - Goal 2

Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format.

Great progress was also made toward achieving this goal. LDD involved the library community in accomplishing some of its objectives. For example, an MLA Special Interest Group developed a new Interlibrary Loan code.

However, the advent of the Montana Library Network changed LDD's approach to this goal. MLN, working with the Networking Task Force, developed separate goals for MLN. In many cases, these MLN goals replaced LDD objectives. The consultants would suggest that even more progress might have been made if the MLN goals had been integrated into the LDD plan. This would have provided for better communication between and among the LDD consultants and the MLN staff.

The difference between the two approaches is that integrating the MLN goals make them *our* goals (MLN and LDD) while separating the goals makes them *their* goals.

Recommendation 19:

MSL should attempt to integrate new and emerging program goals into agency goals whenever possible.

Library Development Department - Goal 3

Montana citizens are served by librarians and trustees who are knowledgeable about all aspects of library service.

Continuing education for librarians has made exceptional progress during the past planning cycle. However, efforts to provide trustee training have been limited. While the new Trustee Guidebook should help, new efforts are needed to reach this audience.

This goal, or something like it, is likely to remain in place as long as library development is part of MSL's mission. What is likely to change the most over time are the methods that will be used to deliver training. The current plan includes an objective that calls for using satellite technology to deliver several workshops. Videoconferencing, web-based instruction, instructional videos, and other delivery methods should also be explored.

The ideal form of training for some librarians and trustees would be training that could be accessed any time of day or night from any location in the State of Montana. However, it should also be noted that some types of instruction (including most technology training) is most successful when opportunities are provided for "hands-on" experiences. MSL also needs to further define the training/CE role of the regional technology consultants.

Library Development Department - Goal 4

Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries.

Both LDD staff and the library community agreed that this goal needs continuing attention. Several objectives in the current plan that have not been completed deal with local library planning. Those involved in drafting the plan obviously recognized that the planning process offers an opportunity to inform stakeholders about the value of library service and the range of services offered.

Recommendation 20:

MSL should build a "public awareness" component into the planning process it uses to develop the next five-year plan. MSL should also use their planning process as an opportunity to "model" desirable behavior; i.e., librarians should recognize that they can apply some of the processes used to develop the State Library plan in their libraries.

Library Development Department - Goal 5

MSL, with federations and local library agencies, will provide leadership to assure that Montana citizens receive excellent library services.

To the degree possible, MSL should seek to employ "robust strategies" in carrying out their plan. Robust strategies are those that allow a single action to accomplish multiple objectives. Working in close cooperation with MLA or with the federations on training or multitype initiatives are examples. This model strengthens the relationship between the State Library and the other organization while, at the same time, it delivers a service or product.

Indiana employed this strategy in carrying out the INSPIRE project. Several LSTA grants were awarded to the Indiana Library Federation (Indiana's library association) to carry out the public awareness component of the project.

Recommendation 21:

Whenever possible, MSL should employ robust strategies to accomplish its goals.

Library Development Department - Goal 6

All Montana citizens have access to library services.

Since contracts (paid for with LSTA funds) will no longer be provided to public libraries for providing services to institutions, new directions for ensuring that institutional residents are served need to be explored. This is likely to be a difficult process.

MSL needs to explore how institutions are being served in other states to determine which model or models will be

most likely to achieve success in Montana. MSL needs to approach the agencies responsible with specific ideas in order to gain support. MSL should not rule out using LSTA to fund demonstrations of "in-house" library service delivery.

Library Development Department - Goal 7

Montana's students are served by school libraries that meet state standards.

The fact that there is a new administration in the Office of Public Instruction was cause for hope among LDD staff and school librarians/media specialists. MSL should continue its recent practice of engaging the school library community in training and MLN initiatives while at the same time attempting to involve OPI.

MSL may have a role to play in heightening OPI's awareness of the needs of school libraries.

Library Development Department Assessment

The Library Development Department has been quite successful at achieving the goals contained in the plan. Staff has demonstrated creativity, flexibility, and endurance in carrying out the plan!

The consultants have three concerns in regard to LDD. The first relates to workload. Some LDD staff are frustrated by the fact that there are so many important things to do and so little time to do them. While additional state-funded staff is one solution, albeit perhaps an impractical one, better time management may also offer some relief. This is not to say that the consultants are not currently managing their time well. It is, however, to suggest that every avenue should be explored to ensure that the consultants have the time to do what they do the best - offer professional advice and assistance. Better time management might include shifting some clerical work to other places in the agency or securing software or handheld computers that will enhance planning or communication.

A second concern relates to the separateness of MLN. While MLN is a unique program, coordination between

MLN and the rest of LDD needs to be enhanced. LDD staff members have an important role to play in securing acceptance of some of the MLN initiatives in the Montana library community.

Finally, several participants in focus groups and interviews mentioned the need for a children's/youth services consultant. Given the current workload, Himmel & Wilson cannot recommend that this function simply be added to the workload of other consultants. Consideration of a children's/youth services consultant should be placed on MSL long-term wish list.

Montana Library Network (MLN)

The Montana Library Network is a rather unique entity. Its separate name and identity give it attention that it might not receive if it was buried within LDD. On the other hand, MLN's small staff contingent and ambitious goals leave little time for careful coordination of efforts with LDD. MLN's independence also exposes it to some criticism that it might not encounter if it was less distinct.

The consultants believe that MLN should retain its separate identity while, at the same time, attempting to integrate itself better into the library development operation.

Montana Library Network Assessment

MLN has been remarkably successful at accomplishing its highly ambitious goals. If there is one criticism of MLN, it probably be that it has too much on its plate to be fully effective. A second criticism, mentioned earlier in the report, is that MLN has not been fully successful in communicating the benefits of its initiatives to the entire library community. This is especially true in the case of small libraries.

We will not recount the MLN goals here since most have already been addressed elsewhere in the report. Rather, the consultants wish to use this opportunity to address the future of MLN. As MLN moves some of its initiatives from vision to reality, there may be the temptation to shift staff attention from planning and innovating to implementing and operating. While some of this is bound

to happen (and in fact already has happened), we believe that it is important to preserve MLN's role as the Montana State Library's "Research and Development (R&D)" division.

Maintaining MLN's R&D role will be difficult given budget constraints (and the consultants' suggestion that MSL wean itself from using LSTA dollars to fund staff), however, we believe that the effort will be worth it. Some portion of the agency needs to be in touch with the latest trends and emerging technologies.

Recommendation 22:

MSL should attempt to preserve MLN's role as the state agency's Research and Development unit.

The consultants would also suggest that closer ties be nurtured between MLN and the Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) staff. We believe that both technology rich units have much to offer each other.

Recommendation 23:

MSL should nurture closer ties between MLN staff and Natural Resource Information System staff.

Library and Information Services Department (LISD)

The Library and Information Services Department (LISD) has experienced a transformation during the past year. LISD is now a different department with a different focus and, to some extent, a different staff.

While implementation of the new direction has clearly been traumatic, there are some hopeful signs that the reorganization is taking hold. Some real progress has been made in moving toward the "preferred futures" outlined in the department's plan.

It appears that some staff members were slow to comprehend the full ramifications of the library's new focus. It appears that everyone understood the emphasis that would be placed on serving state employees; however some staff were uncertain as to what the change would mean for groups of users other than state employees.

LISD's Goals

LISD's goals are based on a series of "preferred futures" statements that were prepared by the department's supervisor prior to the reorganization.

The goals extracted from the preferred futures are consistent with the overarching goal for LISD which is, "making the State Library the first place state employees go for information." The consultants believe that the preferred futures document has been a useful tool for employees in that it describes what they will see and experience if the reorganization is successful.

Library and Information Services Department - Goal 1

An easy to use web interface provides employees with reliable access to pertinent, up-to-date resources of the state library and other agency libraries, including books, journals, state documents, Federal documents, reference databases, and specialty online journals and bibliographic databases.

The general assessment of the staff is that they are building the web site, and, as it offers more content, users will come. The department is able to track use of their web-site, but since there is no baseline data with which to compare, a good assessment of growing use will not be available for a time. However, since a baseline is now being established, LISD should be able to accurately report on its progress on this goal in 2002.

Library and Information Services Department - Goal 2

In 2002, state employees throughout Montana are familiar with and value the services of the Library and Information Services Department.

Staff are at the same time discouraged by the fact that marketing efforts to date have met with limited success and terrified by the prospect that all state employees will descend en masse at one time. It is obvious that more work needs to be done on this goal; however, the department has followed through on its plan to conduct a general campaign and is beginning to move into a more targeted awareness effort.

Library and Information Services Department - Goal 3

Urgent requests receive priority attention and are handled within required timeframes.

Staff felt very good about the quality of service they are currently providing and about their response time, not just on urgent requests, but on all requests. The only concern expressed relates to the potential deterioration of service if LISD is extremely successful in attracting new users.

Library and Information Services Department - Goal 4

Librarians are readily available by telephone or at the Library and assist individuals to define questions, use resources, and develop strategies for finding answers in unfamiliar topic areas.

Again staff felt good about the progress to date. Interviews with several users of LISD services revealed no concerns about the quality of service, either by phone or in person, that is available to state employees.

Library and Information Services Department - Goal 5

State employees use the department's web-site and their email software to register, request loans, photocopies, current awareness services, literature searches, and document retrieval, and to schedule training or consulting services.

Staff was concerned that these electronic services haven't grown more quickly. It was suggested that training might be an issue. In fact, one of the library users who were interviewed indicated that she had tried unsuccessfully to use one of the electronic services and hadn't tried to use it again since. One staff member suggested that LISD should have a mobile computer lab (laptops with wireless network connections) that could be taken into agencies to offer training on using the library's electronic resources.

Library and Information Services Department Assessment

The consultants believe that LISD is headed in the right direction. There is little justification for a State Library playing the role of either a neighborhood branch library or a popular reading room for state employees. The department supervisor describes a compelling model for

service that is patterned after a special library in a corporate setting.

We believe that one of the reasons that the initial implementation of LISD's new role in serving state employees was a bit rocky is that not all of the employees were familiar with the special library model. While the preferred futures document helped to a certain extent, some employees were still clinging to a public library ideal based on personal experience, past practice, and the State Library's close association with the public libraries in the State because of its back-up reference role.

It would appear that the staff is now over this hump. Nevertheless, there are still some problems to be resolved. First, staff members need greater clarity in defining LISD's role with user groups other than state employees. There is little or no problem understanding that casual Internet use by a neighborhood resident falls near the bottom of the staff's scale of priorities. However, there is less clarity when it comes to prioritizing back-up reference requests from public libraries, requests for popular materials from state employees, and research use by the general public. These areas need further delineation.

Second, a number of employees who now understand the full ramifications of a shift to the special library model fear that they will be overwhelmed by success. While the consultants cannot totally discount this fear, experience suggests that use will grow incrementally rather than by leaps and bounds. We believe that an appropriate way to address this concern is through a marketing plan that targets specific departments. Although the preferred futures document calls for a general campaign (which was carried out) in year one, the strategy of targeting specific departments and/or agencies is included as a follow-up activity. The consultants believe that LISD can expect a period of "controlled growth" if the current plan is implemented well.

While it is likely to take at least another year before LISD "works out all the kinks," the consultants do not find this extended period of transition disturbing given the nature of the change that has been implemented. We believe that LISD can, and likely will, play an important role in

providing state employees with the information they need to serve the citizens of Montana.

Recommendation 24:

LISD should further clarify the department's relationship with various types of users.

Recommendation 25:

LISD should work closely with NRIS and with other departmental/agency libraries in Montana State government to further define their respective roles and ways in which they can complement each other in providing excellent service to state employees.

Recommendation 26:

LISD should further clarify and enhance its role in collecting, organizing, preserving, and disseminating state documents.

Natural Resource Information System

The Montana Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) was created in 1985 as a division of the Montana State Library and serves as the clearinghouse for natural resource information. Its mission is to make information on Montana's natural resources readily accessible. NRIS has three components: user services and support, GIS and Information Systems Development, and the Natural Heritage Program. Its strategic plan is organized under five goal areas: data development, data delivery, outreach, working environment, and funding.

NRIS, like LISD, was reorganized in 2000. Consequently the consultants are able to assess only a short period of performance.

Natural Resource System Goals

The NRIS departmental plan is a very detailed strategic plan that outlines not only what will be done and when, but what audiences are targeted and which staff members are responsible for carrying out activities.

Natural Resource Information System - Goal 1

Data Development:

Acquire, integrate, maintain and insure accuracy of spatial and natural resource data and information needed for managing Montana's natural resources and environment.

Current clients appear satisfied in the work that is being done; however proactive identification and acquisition of new databases is still lacking. There are also concerns that little work is being done to ensure the accuracy of data.

Natural Resource Information System - Goal 2

Data Delivery:

Effectively disseminate natural resource data and information, ensuring broad accessibility, utilizing current technologies, and maintaining a strong emphasis on customer-service.

Data is made accessible on the web and knowledgeable users appear to be accessing it. Current clients appear satisfied. NRIS is perceived to be "cutting edge" in this area.

Natural Resource Information System - Goal 3

Outreach:

Ensure that NRIS products, services, and expertise are broadly known, effectively used, and highly regarded by those who require natural resource information and spatially reference data.

This appears to be an area of weakness. None of the people with whom the consultant spoke thought NRIS had made much progress in this area although all of them were quick to point out the new User Services Section head would have outreach as a major responsibility.

Natural Resource Information System - Goal 4

Working Environment:

Establish, maintain and continually improve the program structure, resource(s), staff and operation required to successfully implement NRIS mission, vision and goals.

Morale is still suffering from the loss of staff and changes involved in the reorganization. However, the staff and the director have a mutual respect and seem to recognize what needs to happen to improve the situation.

Natural Resource Information System - Goal 5

Funding:

Secure adequate and stable funding to successfully accomplish NRIS mission and goals.

Progress has been made in that the legislature approved a workable budget for the biennium. The director believes the department has two years (the biennium) to deal with issues of finding the NRIS niche and then using that information in working with the legislature.

Natural Resource Information System Assessment

NRIS, as a department within a state library agency, is unique among the fifty-one state library agencies. Philosophically one can argue NRIS and libraries are in the same business, that of gathering, organizing, and disseminating information.

In some ways NRIS is very similar to a special library in its subject and format focus and in the expertise its staff needs to carry out their work. As in special libraries there are different skill sets needed to serve the primary users than one ordinarily thinks of needing within a library setting. In the case of NRIS there are scientists, Geographic Information System (GIS) programmers, and data coordinators as well as staff with more general technical skills.

NRIS also brings a complex funding structure to the relationship with the State Library. Its budget is a mixture of state funds, "contract" work with other state agencies and with the Nature Conservancy, a private organization whose work is sometimes perceived as highly political.

It would appear that the relationship between the State Library (apart from NRIS) and the Natural Resource

Information System is beneficial for both entities. NRIS gains the perception of political and economic neutrality from its association with the State Library. This appears to be very important to the department. The State Library gains from the “cutting edge” technology and the expertise of web designers and GIS experts in NRIS.

The State Library is making attempts to educate the library community on how they can access and use NRIS resources. The public library survey shows evidence that the libraries have taken this to heart and that many have at least experimented with using NRIS services. Academic libraries in the state already appear to be familiar with NRIS.

Overall, it appears that there has been some progress toward achieving some of the goals in the plan. However, it is too soon for any substantial assessment. The new director of NRIS began in December of 2000 and, necessarily, turned his attention to the legislature and to budget issues. He has only recently been able to focus on redirecting NRIS energies. Participants in the staff focus groups seemed quite positive about the new director and about his abilities to move the department forward. This portends good things for NRIS.

APPENDIX A

Montana State Library Evaluation Library Community Focus Groups

As one element in the “Evaluation of the Montana State Library Long-Range Plan,” Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants conducted six focus group discussions with librarians and trustees in various locations around Montana. Those sessions were held in Billings, Butte, Great Falls, Miles City, Missoula, and Wolf Point. A total of forty-nine people took part in these discussions.

Two additional sessions were held with Talking Books Library users, one in Billings and one in Helena, with twenty people participating. A summary of these sessions follows the notes from each of the six sessions held with librarians and trustees around the state.

Executive Summary:

Overall the participants praised the Montana State Library (MSL) for its leadership. Participants in sessions on the eastern side of the state tended to be concerned about the ongoing economic health of their region and consequently, the future of their libraries. They tended to stress the need for somewhat different assistance from MSL than libraries in the western portion of the state.

The MSL programs and services seen as having the biggest statewide impact were MSL’s overall leadership, the technology consultants’ assistance with automation and Internet connectivity, MLN’s involvement in negotiating group licensing for online databases and OCLC services, and the continuing education programs for librarians. MSL was praised for providing vision, for lobbying the legislature on behalf of Montana libraries, and for pulling libraries of all types together in common pursuits.

The technology consultants received high praise in all the focus group sessions. Participants, especially those from small libraries, did not think they would have been able to accomplish what they have achieved technologically without the assistance of the technology consultants. Most also felt that the OCLC contract and database licensing would not have happened without the assistance (and push) from MLN and the State Librarian.

Some participants, especially those from eastern Montana, were concerned about the costs of some of the technology related projects and whether they were truly viable in the long term. Several questioned whether OCLC would remain affordable and others expressed the concern that participation in shared automation systems was not realistic for small libraries.

Participants in all the sessions gave high praise for the continuing education experiences provided for librarians in the Summer Institutes, the Fall Workshops, and the special workshops related to ILL.

The programs and services having the biggest impact on individual local libraries were closely related to those with the biggest statewide impact. Participants talked about having the first dedicated Internet connection in their county, about being able to learn how to use the technology they were acquiring, about the leadership provided by MSL with Library Improvement Projects. The technology consultants were “a godsend.” The technology assistance has allowed small libraries to connect to the greater community and has given them “confidence.”

Participants talked specifically about goals 1 and 3 of the Library Development Division. Goal 1 states “All Montana citizens have direct access to information through telecommunications at their libraries.” Almost everyone thought that tremendous progress has been made on this goal. However, some expressed a concern that a few libraries would never be able to provide “direct access to information” at a satisfactory level because of an inadequate telecommunications infrastructure in their area. MSL needs to continue to add databases.

Goal 3 states “Montana citizens are served by librarians and trustees who are knowledgeable about all aspects of library service.” Participants said progress for librarians has been great because of the Institutes, workshops, and Fall Workshops. However, trustee training is still an area that needs lots of attention with sessions being developed by MSL and being delivered locally to trustees. Some discussion centered on being realistic about the ongoing lack of a library school and alternatives for professional training the MSL might support.

In some of the sessions participants talked about progress on the other goals: Smaller libraries have made the most progress on goal 2: “Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format,” mostly because they did not have access to many resources before MSL emphasized connectivity and the related technologies.

Goal 4 states “Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries.” MSL has helped, especially with advocacy with the legislature, but local libraries also have a responsibility. MSL should provide leadership in coordinating marketing by writing canned press releases that can be modified for local library use. More databases are needed, especially agriculture related ones that would be of direct use to farmers and ranchers in eastern Montana. Progress has been made, but “we’re not there yet.”

Goal 5 states “MSL, with federations and local library agencies, will provide leadership to assure that Montana citizens receive excellent library services.” As noted above, MSL leadership received really high marks. Some of the federations were also praised.

Goal 6 states “All Montana citizens have access to library services.” Participants noted a continuing need for accessible buildings and pointed out there were no federal or state funds for building construction.

Goal 7 states “Montana’s students are served by school libraries that meet state standards.” Participants said school libraries in Montana are resource poor. Some didn’t think MSL had made any effort in this area, but others pointed out school libraries weren’t a responsibility of MSL, but rather the job of OPI. However, others noted that MSL was making a real effort to reach out to schools.

Top priorities for the next strategic plan should be current goals 6 and 5. Some people were careful to point out that other goals remain important and that 5 and 6 should be the priorities because there is much more work to be done in these areas. Participants also suggested adding goals for information literacy, resource sharing, coordination among libraries, and legislative information leadership to trustees. Other additions were clarifying the laws and definitions relating to federations and finding a solution to funding problems for rural libraries.

Participants also looked at the goals of the other MSL divisions. They decided the Talking Book Library needs more visibility and better promotion. Some participants also felt that the Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) needs more promotion among librarians, especially in showing library staffs how NRIS services can be useful to them and to their library users. Some participants said the information was being provided at some meetings, but they personally had been too involved with other issues at the time or were intimidated by the complexity of NRIS.

One person suggested that the goals of the Montana Library Network need to be stated in plain English. She asked, “What do Montanaiana, authentication, and authorization mean here (in the MLN goals)?”

There were a few criticisms of MSL. Some participants, particularly in eastern Montana, were concerned that the people at MSL don’t understand libraries serving small, rural populations, nor do they understand the dire financial straits of eastern Montana. In other sessions, librarians thought MSL was too dependent upon federal funds and was not sufficiently supported by the state legislature. People in several sessions criticized Wired Montana as being too gossipy and not sufficiently professional. Some were unhappy that MSL did not have consulting help for children’s librarians and services. Others thought there was too much emphasis on technology and too little on traditional library services in the programs and services provided by MSL.

The pages that follow contain more detail in the form of comments from the discussions at each of the six sites.

Billings Focus Group

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact in the state?

Leadership has been incredibly good; the summer institute and fall workshops have been critical for both new librarians and those who've been in Montana libraries.

The shared resources and the magazine database have helped kids the most.

They've (MSL) been able to use state money as well as LSTA funds more successfully.

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact on your library?

Technology has had a big impact as has having shared resources. LaserCat helps us find what we need and ILL service is faster and better than ever before. When MLN got the OCLC contract we were able to go on-line.

We have had the opportunity to learn to use the technology we've gotten. MSL has changed the mindset of people who work in libraries. Having technology leadership at the State Library has helped us to feel more comfortable with it. MSL has encouraged the multi-type federations.

Would these things have happened without grant funding or statewide initiatives?

We'd still be waiting for an Internet computer for public use.

Many of the smaller libraries wouldn't have access to the periodical articles. (Several mentioned specific databases and digitization projects.)

I'm not really sure our board would have gone along with technology and LaserCat without the additional funds.

What I really like is having Suzanne and Bob Cooper there for help. We wouldn't have the confidence to do things without them. Statewide there wouldn't have been as much e-rate funds; we would just have checked it without their help.

Comments on Goals

Goal 1:

Technology consultants are very important; MSL set a standard—having telecommunications—and then pushed us to do that.

Some of the things that are helpful to small libraries are hurtful to the larger ones. We can find things easier for ILL, but there's still the problem of handling and getting things to requesting libraries.

Goal 2:

A lot of smaller libraries have access to things in other states because of OCLC –full text databases.

Smaller libraries have seen more improvement in this area because we're just now getting what larger libraries have had before.

I'd give this goal a lower rating because of the ILL problems.

Distance is a real issue in Montana; delivery issues remain.

Goal 3:

There's been a real push in the last 4 or 5 years to get good quality CE credit for all of us.

Board education and involvement is really important. The new trustee manual is good.

They've been popular reading trustees...now they're learning more about information.

MSL needs to go out and go more trustee training, especially with districts with elected trustees. MSL has to go to the trustees. Progress on this goal is an "A" for librarians and a "B" for trustees.

MSL has done a good job on legislative information.

The state needs a more meaningful e-mail system, a list serv especially for trustees.

Goal 4:

The range of services is good; MSL has helped local libraries with mil levies; MSL does advocacy with the legislature, but we have a responsibility as well. This is our responsibility; local library needs to get more information out.

Goal 5:

Leadership in last 5 or 6 years has been excellent. You can talk to all the MSL staff.

Bridgit is doing a great job with the federation. "As a trustee I appreciate the MSL's work with the legislature, but I'm not aware of much else that they do. I don't have much of a relationship with MSL."

Goal 6:

Have access, but not an accessible building. Some people have access, but they don't use it.

The standards have pushed libraries to be open more hours.

Goal 7:

It's a joke. School libraries are resource poor. From a higher education standpoint, kids are getting the technology training, but not the book training.

Biggest criticism of MSL?

Automation in small libraries is a problem. No allowance is made for small libraries that can't afford bigger systems.

Some dislike the idea of being so dependent upon OCLC for our Montana catalog.

Miles City

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact in the state? What has had biggest impact on your library?

Internet, automating libraries, funding databases at a very reasonable price. MSL is very good about trying to include all of us. The state technicians teach you to teach others; they're on the phone, fax, Wired Montana all the time. "It's like having a technician in your pocket."

Suzanne Rymer's response time is really great...you never have to wait more than a few hours, even when she's out of the area.

OCLC has been very important...98% hit rate on cataloging and we'd never have been able to afford it ourselves.

INFOTRAC is the biggest thing for us.

I have my criticisms of the statewide library catalog, but it's a great resource.

The Summer Institute is wonderful...a great learning possibility.

Would these things have happened without grant funding or statewide initiatives?

State library has provided leadership in pooling our resources; we'd never been able to do this on our own. Internet wouldn't have happened for years and years.

Comments on the Goals

Priorities for MSL should be generating dollars for libraries and giving it out without strings, and personally visiting each library.

MSL isn't staffed well enough to get to training. Training has to be practical and be delivered to the libraries.

Definitely want to keep the three technology people, and the INFOTRAC databases.

There should be more health components in the statewide databases, more clinical information. Also should be agriculture databases to draw the ranchers in.

The summer institute should be offered for college credit and it should be moved around the state. State should provide some leadership in coordinating marketing, write some canned press releases.

Biggest criticism of MSL?

MSL thinks if you do the project, the money will come...Where are we going to be able to get the money?

I'm afraid that we're getting sucked in, and once you're in it's hard to back out of it (the shared catalog).

They don't seem to get it that the money's not there. We're going through a crucial reorganization of small libraries. Library Districts may save our small libraries.

Behind all of this is the question as to whether the public will spend the money on what we're offering. I'm afraid they're trying to make us tech junkies and that we won't be able to afford it.

To me getting away is a problem for attending the Institute. I wish we could have more things out here. Most of us are happy if they get it as far east as Bozeman.

The MSL should investigate computers from companies that have folded.

The reference line? Who uses it?

The base grants have changed and the new rules are very restrictive.

(Note: one criticism that came up wasn't exactly about MSL: "WLN was more used to working with small libraries...OCLC isn't used to it.")

Overall the comments seemed to be that, other than the technology consultant serving the eastern libraries, nobody at the MSL understood the financial problems that libraries have in eastern Montana. They needed/wanted building grants. They thought LSTA should be changed on the federal level to benefit those who most needed it rather than being based on population. They discussed library districts, but were unsure people in the their area would approve of the concept (The feeling is that the public is against anything that costs money).

Wolf Point

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact in the state? on your library?

Lobbying the legislature; they got us \$400,000 for the databases. The INFOTRAC and LaserCat training programs have been supreme.

Getting the first computers and Internet into libraries. “The State Library has always been there.” “They worked to make sure that every library got Internet access.” The standards are good; give libraries tools.

The Trustee manual is good for librarians and trustees.

The training has been awesome in the last five years; you used to have to go to Helena.

ILL training is making us all consistent.

The technology person has been a godsend.

The County Commissioner didn’t see the need for technology, but when the state offered the grant, that gave me the impetus to ask the City to fund the phone service.

They used to be a wonderful reference source—had an 800 number and they were very good about it.

Comments on the Goals:

Goal 1:

They’re making a real effort; but libraries are still struggling with telecommunications. They (MSL) did help, but it would have been better if they gave me the dollars for the phone line at first.

Goal 2: No comments

Goal 3:

Need to do more helping the trustees learn the laws.

I’m not sure this should be a goal at all.

There’s been one trustee workshop in the six years I’ve been here. There need to be some trustee workshops without the library directors.

As a trustee, I wouldn’t know what the state library does without the federation.

Goal 4:

Montana citizens do value their libraries.

I don't think that Montana people do know about their libraries, but I also think that with decreased income there will be more use of libraries. I think we need more agriculture stuff through INFOTRAC. We're pretty well covered on health issues.

Goal 5:

It would be nice to have more help with marketing. They're doing much better than they did.

Goal 6:

Some libraries are charging for services they shouldn't charge for.

Goal 7:

Don't think they've made any real effort. Personally, I think the state library's purpose isn't to set standards for school libraries.

My point of view is that the state library is for public libraries.

That's OPI's job...MSL has done a good job in taking up the slack.

Priorities for the next five years?

Maintain the federations, but clarify the laws and definitions relating to them.

Clean up the listserv...I took myself off of it because it had a lot of junk on it. Should be more professional and less gossipy.

Priorities should be service to communities.

Figuring out a solution for funding rural libraries should be a priority. MSL could help train us to lobby our commissioners and the people. It's the distribution of the money that's the problem...the money is there, but it's specifically designated for road graders.

Interlibrary loan is very important...I depend upon others for fiction, resource sharing.

Biggest criticism of MSL?

The isolation...I would like a concerted effort to make sure they videotape or video conference any workshop held in Helena.

Most of the MSL staff haven't worked in a one person library; they try to understand, but it's hard because they mostly came from large libraries.

We hadn't ever seen a State Librarian before Karen came. (this was a response to the criticism above about isolation.)

They'd like the LSTA program to be an easy collection development grant instead of a technology grant—just fill in the blanks.

In one-person libraries there isn't time to look for grants, can't the MSL fund a grant writer on staff for a year?

Missoula

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact in the state?

MLN—connectivity, makes you in touch and able to realize some goals.

Statewide database. We're working on a shared catalog, we're seeing results—not just talking.

The statewide technology consultants fit in well with MLN. They're getting libraries online, understanding individual library needs.

I had my doubts about the consultants at the beginning, whether that approach would work. But they're quality people, very accessible, always get back to you when you call.

They're especially helpful in small libraries where director doesn't have a library degree. They're someone to call when you have problems/questions.

The state library has a better vision, a clearer vision of what should be. You see that in the seminars and workshops. I appreciated that the latest workshop (Kalispell conference) was low tech.

We're not seeing much from MLN yet. Only the segment of the library community directly working on MLN is really involved with it at this point.

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact on your library?

Magazine databases are most visible to users. They don't know/care about the background stuff—how we got them.

ILL users are benefiting from the negotiated agreement with OCLC, and earlier from the LaserCat.

LSTA grants allow small libraries to be connected and there's also the push from the state library to get connected. We had no Internet access before that.

We expected the serials database to be a godsend, but the patron survey showed it was the service least known. We're losing people and we don't know why.

We're having the opposite experience, but it's from the individual librarians contacting/talking with people: "did you know you could get that on the database?"

We're losing users too; people are using computers for email, not databases, at the library.

The shared catalog is going to let patrons see we're part of a bigger community.

OCLC has new items on it, that's wonderful. People can get things faster.

InfoTrac is used more by staff to help the public (than being used by the public directly) The public isn't confident enough yet to go right to it.

Would these things have happened without grant funding or statewide initiatives?

There's no way my library would have the INFOTRAC databases if the state hadn't supported it.

Nor would we be online with OCLC. The shared catalog is going to be great.

We've had to struggle with fluctuating budgets that always hit acquisitions. We wouldn't have invested in INFOTRAC without additional support.

The databases let me work with a different clientele. INFOTRAC is much more on the level of what some people can understand. (this is from a special library)

We would have gotten the databases, but having them provided saves us money that we can shift to other things we need. Students also come to us with public library experience in using INFOTRAC now so they're more familiar with resources.

State library's pushing multi-types has made us know each other much better.

We can find out who's got what we want! Cooperation works in both directions: academic library relies on public library to collect in auto manuals, etc. In Missoula we do informal cooperative collection development, in humanities for example. It's a Montana approach for academic and publics to cooperate. It's a real bargain for the community. In Kalispell, he buys the "dull, but worthy books" and I buy the frivolous, but delicious stuff!

From having east-coast special library experience I can tell you, Montana is different; networking is really good here. Some communities are better than others, but... And it's all because of the state library."

Goals and comments:

Goal 1:

Missoula has a small branch that has public Internet access now,--access is really expanded. In 1997 we had no Internet access. All of us who work there would have been helpless without the state library training on it all.

I came from Idaho where there were lots of competitive LSCA grants, I was dismayed how much stayed at the state library here.

I'm glad the state library has a plan, dollars aren't just being sucked into the State Library. The technology consultants are a good example.

Some tiny libraries still don't have Internet access; a few still don't have telephones. It's still a worthy goal. There's an infrastructure problem in MT: Sprint ads say you can get high speed service anywhere, but no, you can't!

We can't link with a branch because the lines to there are so poor. And, a lot of this is outside the state library's hands.

Goal 3:

There are a lot of librarian training and opportunities, but we still have some to go for trustees. One trustee who went said it was good, but only one from each library in a federation was funded to go. Some are teachers and can't get substitutes so they can go.

I was on standards committee...liked how the state library said these aren't meant to be punitive. Karen said it's the state library's responsibility to see that libraries meet these. It's nice to see they have a plan and that implementation is at work.

The week long Institute is great

Still need more with trustees.

Our trustees aren't like school trustees who are mandated to attend workshops and education sessions.

Some trustees think anyone can be a librarian; they wouldn't have agreed to be trustees if they had known the responsibilities that trustees truly have.

At the Lamar meeting there was one trustee from each library; there needs to be a session that's for all trustees in a federation for a day.

The standards committee talked about requiring trustee workshop attendance, but didn't make that a standard.

We have no library school, nor the money to attract one. Have to keep our expectations and requirements realistic.

The Montana Library Association provides some money for scholarships.

I have a trustee (the mayor) who used to be against the state library. Now he even testified at the legislature in support of state library.

The fellowship (of the federation) and the workshops have been wonderful.

Summer Institute is fabulous. I thought of “those people at the state library,” now I’m comfortable in calling them. There’ll never be an MLS in my community unless they’re independently wealthy.

Do the continuing education activities and workshops that are offered conflict/compete with each other?

State library employees are on state library association board, so there’s lots of cross-pollination. That keeps everyone in the know.

Once in a while there are conflicts—things scheduled too closely together, but there probably aren’t enough continuing education programs.

There’s distance education from Arizona. I looked into it, but when it got here, we didn’t need it. I decided I wouldn’t get any more money (for having higher degree), so there wasn’t any incentive to take it. So I just keep my teaching certificate current.

Somebody at Kalispell conference also brought up the state library’s voluntary certification.

Other ideas from Kalispell: There wasn’t much in tech services available and there’s the whole paraprofessional issue—now there’s an interest group for this. Tech services people need to get together more often, maybe along with the fall workshop.

Session for paraprofessionals has to be at a different time so that someone can keep the library open.

Voluntary certification isn’t really worth the bother.

Things need to be close to home, interesting, and related to your work. Needs to be something for specific areas (tech services, reference, etc.)

Maybe traveling workshops, going from federation to federation. Do within a federation but have participants from all types of libraries so they can make connections with each other.

Academics need the training too, support staff especially.

Maybe MSL could arrange for us to take college courses (related to libraries/literature) but not for a degree. Maybe explore distance learning in Montana.

Biggest criticism of MSL?

I don't want the State Library to be so dependent on federal dollars; want better entitlement in Montana, so the state library doesn't have to beg for funds.

Technology consultants should be paid from the state—tried that this year but failed.

Our problems aren't well known by the legislature, we aren't "squeaky" enough. They think we "get by as it is, nothing's broken."

I like having competitive grants, but only bigger libraries have staff who have time and skills to write grants.

The Senator from Thompson Falls is impressed by the State Library!

State Library effort this year was good at getting information to legislators on issues.

I don't feel negative about the state library and that's a change! Some decision making IS going on, there's real professionalism and progress there. Makes you feel you understand what's going on and that you're a part of it.

The school librarian at Kalispell complained to me about postings on the listserv—state library's not buying any books for them. Problem is that OPI isn't making things available for them!

Do the MSL priorities seem to be the right ones for Montana?

I don't know about NRIS

They talk about NRIS in the reports, but I "zone out," don't understand what we could tap into. Seems really complex.

Talking books is a vulnerable area. Goal 2 there is being met—users tell me they get good, quick service. Having the state library recording old Montana books into talking books is a splendid use of dollars.

I like that they (TBL) handle it all themselves. All we have to do is turn in names to TBL.

Goal 1 should be goal for all libraries everywhere.

NRIS must provide excellent information, we just need another workshop on how to use it. School and public libraries, even health libraries could use their information. Problem is it gets lumped in with MLN, etc. in the reporting and you tend to ignore it.

What do you see as future directions? What should be addressed in the next strategic plan?

State library in Idaho provided professional development grants, they paid up to \$1500/person, you had to come back and provide a workshop on what you learned. That would be a good thing to do here because it wouldn't be a big library/little library issue. There should be a chunk of money for this.

Projects are so time consuming to write.

Maybe the goals and priorities need to be set in terms of reaching, say, 92% done, then we move on to new goals. Some libraries are never going to get it. Moving on would free up some dollars for something different

Need STATE funding for things!

The shared catalog is a marvelous use of federal dollars; it's regional rather than statewide, but still bigger than one library.

Training has to have a higher priority, so does coordination/facilitation among libraries of different types. Academics in public institutions have community service as a requirement. State library should be active in hammering out coordination among types of libraries. Define more the role of multi-types; give academics more responsibility.

In the future plan the MSL should maintain tech consultants, MLN, and technology. Don't let those disappear, but at some point MSL should move toward supporting more coordination among types of libraries.

Maybe fund an itinerant cataloger for special things?

Priorities should be to continue the technology stuff, sustain and train.

Butte

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact in the state?

Technology consultants have been a real boon; they hold hands and trouble shoot.

MLN has helped—access to holdings for students.

LISD—University is state docs depository and LISD has made significant changes in that. Documents are more accessible in the depository system. LISD is in transition, but is making people aware of state docs.

Ongoing continuing education has been important: 2 fall conferences and week-long Institute.

Statewide licensing agreements: databases and OCLC. LaserCat was good at the beginning when it was WLN, but WLN wasn't as big at OCLC. OCLC is a major improvement.

Licensing for INFOTRAC and OCLC have happened because of MSL's political efforts, being our voice in the legislature; they (MSL staff) do a good job in both directions (legislature and librarians)

Prior to 1997 there was no unity in pulling people together—it's a terrific way to use resources; MSL has pulled that off. Also has been trying to pull academic/school/public libraries together.

What program or activity has had the biggest impact on the users of your library?

Our library benefited from getting the Internet line. It was first one in the county. Then we had a library improvement project in Madison County. That has brought us together, including the Harrison area. Resource sharing has benefited us all.

Technology consultants have been a tremendous help—with e rate, etc. "They walk us across every bridge."

We got a \$40,000 LIP grant to consolidate. We were really impressed with the help we got. Bob Cooper and Karen gave us lots of help. We'll keep working on it.

Would these things have happened without grant funding or statewide initiatives?

Access wouldn't have happened without the federal dollars. There are 18 big libraries, but all the rest serve under 5,000 people and the small ones wouldn't have had Internet.

Databases would have happened eventually. State library would eventually have had to have technology staff.

MLN: resource sharing wouldn't have happened—MSL got the idea going. There's so much politics in local communities, they're afraid to share with non-residents.

The LIP (Library Improvement Project) and tech grant—no way we would have been able to do that. We're in such a wide geographic area.

The direct line has made a huge difference. We tried before and couldn't get there. The Ruby part of the Valley is poorer than the Ennis area...MSL brought us all together.

Because of the grants INFOTRAC is available indirectly in my special library.

Biggest impact has been in ILL.

MSL is our political voice. I'm grateful someone else in taking on the politics. Libraries need unity, someone speaking out for us. "I need a bigger voice."

A lot has come to Montana libraries since 1997. Large libraries get more local funds (so they're "richer", but not so on a per capita basis. Large libraries have needs too.

Our patrons demand Internet. That's what they come into our library for. (a small library)

Many of us are confused about where LSTA funds go. Prior to Wired MT the federal funds went into individual grants. It's worrisome because in Wyoming the state legislature wouldn't pick up funding because the state library had access to federal grants

Almost all the LSTA funds stay with MSL. In the beginning local libraries got funds. The issue is whether small libraries do better because of enriched statewide resources...

There are a wide variety of needs in MT. Health library has technology, but has trouble getting it to work. Other libraries don't have the technology to begin with. It's important that the state library is aware of that conflict. We're all changing quickly, so it's important that there's someone looking out toward the future. Schools need help too—that's a whole new issue. Lots of things could be coordinated. Health libraries could help public libraries with health questions.

Keeping the federal funds at the State Library isn't a bad solution for the present. Isolated librarians now have a place to go.

If they sent the federal money all out to libraries, we wouldn't be able to purchase as much. (Two people in the group still said they would like funds available for innovative grants. Their complaint was that there's no room for any vision other than that of the MSL at present.)

Large libraries should be able to try innovative things. We did a shared catalog, which was very expensive, on our own before the state library decided that was a good idea.

A disproportionate amount of money has gone/is going into MLN.

On our campus we have the technical support that other libraries don't.

Goals and comments:

Goal 1:

Prior to 1997 we had one computer. My board didn't see the need.
We have Gates to credit as well, not just MSL.

This goal has been achieved, but it was Gates funds that did it. (LSTA did put lines into libraries before '97. Since '97 it has been a different story)

In '94 most small public libraries had no Internet access. All MT citizens is a pretty lofty goal; there isn't any way we can reach some remote folks.

It depends on what part of Goal 1 you emphasize. We do need to continue to add databases, especially full text. Do need to offer more.

Goal 3:

The Fall conference and Institutes go a long way.

Would like MSL to do as Utah does—provide more trustee workshops and training.

Training needs to come to the trustees, from the state level. Trustees are volunteers—important to go to them. They wouldn't go to a camp!

This goal will never be met!

Trustees expect librarians to lead them, to do the work. They aren't in a position to know if there are other possibilities in solving problems, in setting directions.
(the trustee in the group agreed: important that the state library come to the trustees.)
Then we could depend on the trustees more.

We don't have enough personnel so I don't have time to keep up professional development myself.

My trustees need more legal assistance from the state library.

There also needs to be some way of making city and county officials more knowledgeable about library responsibilities.

Biggest criticism of MSL?

I'd like more help for children's librarians and services. There is no one at MSL to do that. Others agreed—important to balance traditional library things with technology support.

Shared services are fine, technology is here to stay, but I have a problem sometimes with the over emphasis on technology. "We're afraid to be behind."

We need to look at user demand and needs. Computers take up space that used to be used for public tables.

MLA has taken over children's programming and is a tremendous success, but it's also a lot of work for MLA to be carrying.

MSL needs to look at what's working/not working in the state. All of us are losing funds and personnel. The role of the state library isn't to serve just public libraries. Public libraries are cooperating. Cooperation is our survival. State library needs to coordinate that for all libraries.

We need more from MSL for children's and YA. Missoula Public does the states' YA advocacy!

What's your assessment of the way the LSTA program is administered?

I don't know how the state library decides how to spend funds—would be interesting to know about those decisions.

I don't have a feel for how federations fit in. The federation trustees voted to spend funds for MSL?

Are the priorities in the Long Range Plan the right ones?

Cooperation/coordination with all libraries should be top goal.

In 3.5 years as director I've never talked to anyone at TBL, NRIS, or LISD...they're not reaching out to local public libraries at all!

Whether you know about TBL depends upon whether you have patrons who use it. NRIS Goal 3 especially: nobody at the public library has a clue on how to use it. If they looked at it they'd be overwhelmed. The professionals who use it depend on it and we don't interface at all. Or, there are lots of people who would use it if they could.

We use it extensively. (Academic librarian)

We tend not to go to their workshops because there are other things we need more. Patrons aren't demanding it.

TBL focus is internal? It really should be more broadly known.

How do NRIS and LISD fit together?

I want to be sure access to information is access to reliable information. That should be in the goals of MLN somewhere, some emphasis on information literacy.

What should the top two priorities be for the next plan?

Information literacy, not just access to data.

Coordination among various types of libraries; balancing the disparity between technology and traditional library services and programs.

Resource sharing and children's services expertise

Resource sharing expertise and the statewide catalog

State online catalog and coordination with other state agencies

Resource information and more access to NRIS

Outreach consultant who helps with a variety of problems or issues and then moves on to another federation or area

Information literacy and cooperation; we all need to access the resources of rich special libraries.

Continued outreach to bring libraries up to standards in all areas

Is there anything else you'd like to add?

I hate that there's no construction funding available.

There are problems with complete transition to technology –where are you going to put those new computers in your crowded old building.

Need recognition that buildings are aging, that we're outgrowing our space
When you call the state library, they don't know where there are any building grants.

Karen Strege is an incredible leader. She showed vision with the LIP projects. She's drawing libraries together and representing us well.

Sue Jackson is always optimistic and makes things work.

Great Falls

What program or activity of the MSL has had biggest impact in the state? What has had biggest impact on your library?

The three technology consultants, our library hasn't used them, but they're really important.

We called Sue Jackson lots of times to get our network going (hardware); John Finn helped too.

The statewide contract for INFOTRAC databases has helped all of us, academics included.

Consultants' help with e-rate was very important.

The state pushed technology on us whether we wanted it or not; don't know if we would have done it otherwise. I said NO!, we still laugh about that. (She was one of biggest proponents on how wonderful things are.) Now I'm proud of it! Part of problem was not knowing where to go for help.

Space is a problem in small libraries (and academic libraries too) Computers take room. We have a 10 station computer room—are really having a good year. Also have an IMLS grant (Native American—not LSTA) to set up a lab and do retro.

The Cascade County Historical Society and public library applied and were turned down for a grant 2 years ago—digitization grant went to Bozeman instead.

Would these things have happened without grant funding or statewide initiatives?

It might have happened, but it would have been painful. Our local funders weren't real accepting, didn't trust those people. State has helped in getting us all on the same systems.

At the college we push technology, but at the local public library (Harlem) I don't think they would have the technology at all.

What progress has been made in reaching goal 1: All citizens have direct access...through telecommunications?

Definite progress, look at the e-rate; INFOTRAC.

We've gotten Gates grants too; that's not LSTA, but the state library facilitated it all. There's been a big push from State library to get Internet access into every public library in the state. They've done a good job in getting people to help.

What progress has been made in reaching goal 3: Citizens served by librarians and trustees ...knowledgeable about all aspects of library service?

Federation has workshops; Summer Institute; MLA training; Fall retreat; Trustee training manual.

The two trustees in the session hadn't participated in any training provided by MSL. One thought the state library was more interested in the library directors.

The manuals are helpful, but it's hard to get trustees involved. Many don't want to deal with issues.

MSL doesn't really know who all the trustees are. There are 3 libraries in Choteau County, so why aren't there three packets here to be delivered? (Note: consultant was delivering the trustee manuals for MSL.)

All my trustees work, so they can't attend things.
(A director) thought a one-day workshop for trustees every year was necessary, because somebody's term ends every year and someone new comes on board. Hold this within the federations. Maybe do video training, while not perfect, that would be better than nothing.

Big time! The trustees don't know what they're doing!

There are things for them at the federation meetings, but even there they aren't spending time on how important trustees are.

It takes a year to learn what to do as a trustee.

You just had to learn by watching the others when you were new.

You can be on the board only 10 years!

Only two of my trustees come regularly to meetings.

Pathfinders has a committee on continuing education for librarians.
Federations do training for certification.

Boards in general (outside the library world) don't get much training.
Some people come onto the library board just because it looks good on their resume (one librarian related that a young board member had told her that)

Our board here at Great Falls is pretty good (about attendance).

Biggest criticism of MSL?

Problems are logistic...if you're in a one-person library, you can't get away for things.

There's a missing goal—it's the duty of the state library to get information out. We (trustees) got no direction from the state library on how various legislative bills would impact libraries. It all went out on Wired Montana to directors and missed trustees.

Karen does give legislative updates at federations meetings.

Comments on Goals:

Two participants thought Goal 2 (...timely access...despite location or format) should be the first priority.

Goal 4: Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries.

MSL should do more PR packaging that can be used by all libraries.—canned presentations on e-rate for example, things we could put in our local newspapers.

That doesn't work in our town. In our small town we have to pay to put things in the newspaper! We have a "What's new at the library" column, but we have to pay for it.

All the goals are worthwhile, but Goal 4 hasn't been reached yet.

What do you think should be the top two priorities in the next strategic plan?

First priority:

Five said (current goal 6), All Montana citizens have access to library services.

One each said current goal 4: Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries; goal 2: Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format; and goal 5: MSL, with federations and local library agencies, will provide leadership to assure that Montana citizens receive excellent library services.

Second priority:

Five of them said (current goal 5), MSL, with federations and local library agencies, will provide leadership to assure that Montana citizens receive excellent library services.

One each said current goal 4: Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries; goal 2: Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format; and goal 6: All Montana citizens have access to library services.

Are there other, additional goals that should be added?

Legislative information leadership—getting to trustees as well as directors. Would carry more weight with the legislators if it were the trustees speaking rather than the directors.

Look at goals of other divisions, agencies within state library, what do you know about these?

TBL—a couple knew about its services

Are hearing about it less and less these days; isn't being publicized as much as it was.

There's a misconception that it's different; has nothing to do with us.

NRIS—they had a workshop at MLA (Kalispell); also set up at legislative day. Maybe need a poster or something like that for display at public libraries (for public awareness) TBL and NRIS are prime candidates for PR.

Professionals actively involved with the environment know about NRIS. (The librarians in the group thought this was true.)

MLN

These goals need translation into English! (reaction to these was strong) Goal 2 needs some explanation! Hi-Line is in 1, 2, and 3 here, but you'd never know it. Have to use less technical terms if we want people to be interested in what's happening. "Should we really have a statewide catalog? How important is that really? We couldn't afford to mail things around anyway!"

In Great Falls at patron at home can get into the Gateway, order books on ILL, but the librarians see the request before it goes on. (this was in response to two people in the group, one in particular, who wasn't so sure all the resource sharing was a good idea. She said she needed those things at home for her own patrons.)

One participant didn't want to share resources.

Many are still on LaserCat.

Some aren't automated.

There's nothing for Winnebago (stand alone automation system) libraries on the shared catalog.

One person asked, "What do Montanaiana, authentication, and authorization mean in the Goals?"

APPENDIX B

Personal Interviews - Library Community

The consultants conducted many interviews as a part of the evaluation process. Users of the Talking Book Library, the Library and Information Services Department (LISD), and the Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) were interviewed. A majority of MSL staff members participated in focus groups and most staff with supervisory responsibilities were interviewed individually. Reports on these interviews can be found at the end of the reports on those departments.

The consultants also interviewed most of the directors of the libraries that hosted focus group sessions and a number of other individuals whom the MSL staff had suggested as interview subjects. What follows here is a summary of the information gathered from the fourteen additional persons who were interviewed. They represent public, academic, and school library directors, former advisory council members, and a Montana resident who is a member of the National Commission Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS).

Library directors were asked about the impact of both statewide initiatives and LSTA grants awarded specifically to their institutions. Although Montana has not been highly active in offering individual "re-grants" in recent years, interviewees indicated that grants given in the past had been important to their libraries. The small total amount of LSTA aid received by Montana was mentioned by several and it was noted that there have been fewer and fewer individual grants since the emphasis has changed to technology (under LSTA). Still, extending technology through connectivity grants to the small, remote libraries is seen by most as being very important. The "Summer Institutes" for librarians have also been well received. The use of LSTA dollars to support the regional technology consultants appears to be the most popular program of all. A majority of those interviewed seemed to think that MSL is headed in the right direction and just needs to keep on with its current goals of getting more technology, technology support, and high-quality training to the libraries.

It was noted that funding for libraries in Montana is always an issue. Several suggested that initiatives to improve funding, both from the State of Montana and from local governments may be the next major issue that should be addressed by MSL. Demonstration projects, such as the LSTA-funded "Library Improvement Project for Madison County," were seen as one way, but perhaps not the only way to address funding concerns. The worry about funding, even to the point of questioning whether some libraries would continue to exist, seemed to be most acute in the eastern portion of the state. Several interviewees pointed out that their communities had experienced a decline in both population and tax-base in recent years.

Interviews with academic library directors revealed that the Montana State Library programs have relatively little impact on the larger academic libraries although it was mentioned that initiatives such as the statewide licensing program do help to save a few dollars. However, academic library directors said that the leadership at MSL has become

noticeably better in recent years. The general opinion seemed to be that MSL now has a better sense of the big picture than before and that the agency is considering and involving all types of libraries in its decision making.

The academic directors thought that MSL, especially LISD, may want to look at more ways of offering services at a distance, e.g., reaching state employees outside Helena with electronic resources. Some felt that the State Library also had a role to play in offering full-text databases directly to the general public. One person who expressed the opinion that the efforts of libraries in Montana are hampered by a lack of local funding said, "Perhaps MSL needs to look at statewide models like OhioNet (OH) and Galileo/Peachnet (GA) for models."

Overall, the State Library was seen as being very active and visible. One director said, "The Montana State Library has a good relationship with the academic community." This person went on to suggest that he would like to see his campus library become an active player in a statewide multi-type library network.

Representatives of school library/media centers indicated that there is a growing expectation on the part of school libraries that MSL can help them in some way. The school libraries seem to feel abandoned by the Office of Public Instruction and have responded positively to MSL's efforts to reach out to them. They see "Wired Montana" as a valuable source of information that they weren't getting in the past. School library staff are also appreciative of continuing education opportunities offered by the State Library. One of the interviewees suggested that OPI and MSL should work together to develop training resources such as web-based tutorials, video-taped workshops, and distance learning sessions for school library staff.

Many of the public library interviewees mentioned that the MSL has been very visible in recent years and praised the State Librarian for her communication skills and her willingness to listen to and consider all points of view. Even individuals who indicated some disagreement with specific decisions or policies characterized MSL's decision-making processes as being fair and open. There seemed to be wide acceptance that the State Library was diligently working to benefit library services in communities of all sizes and in every area of the state.

The Montana State Library was seen as an important provider of continuing education for librarians and other library staff. Both the Fall Workshops and the Summer Institute sessions were mentioned, but it was the Summer Institute format that was consistently singled out for praise. Several people did say that there should be more variety in the workshops MSL provides. One person said, "They seem to focus too much on technology when there are also needs in service areas and people oriented things." However, most felt that the emphasis on technology was appropriate and what was needed was the technology focus *plus* other offerings. One person commented, "The State Library has tried to do a lot and the State Librarian makes herself available; they just haven't gone far enough in developing the certification program and an associate degree so that librarians can upgrade themselves."

One director indicated his agreement and bemoaned the fact that poor library budgets make recruiting qualified staff in Montana extremely difficult. He said that his library sends staff to the Summer Institute and will continue to do so in the future. However, he continued "You're not going to train anybody in a week and none of the libraries in our area can afford anybody who is already trained."

Most of those interviewed agreed that the MSL focus is pretty much on small libraries. However, this focus was seen as appropriate even to the directors of larger libraries. Those interviewed from smaller libraries seemed a bit overwhelmed by the speed of change. "They're (MSL) pulling us along very fast."

A few directors bemoaned the dearth of competitive grant programs using LSTA funding; however, it was also noted that Montana's share of LSTA is rather meager. One public library director said, "Montana gets so little LSTA money that using it for little grants would fritter it away." He continued, "It's not really enough to have a major impact." "Give the money 100% to the MSL and let them fund statewide programs from that." Another director voiced support for cooperative licensing saying that most individual libraries in Montana aren't of interest to most vendors but that vendors do pay attention to a contract to provide databases to all libraries in Montana.

Several individuals indicated their strong support for the Talking Book Library's services. The services TBL offers were seen as being one that was most effectively handled on a statewide basis. A few people also mentioned that local libraries also have a role to play in serving persons with disabilities and two people pointed out that some libraries still do not fully comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act's guidelines.

Several interviewees expressed the opinion that higher LSTA funding was needed. They believed that the current funding of less than \$ 800,000 per year wasn't sufficient to have much impact given Montana's vast size and widely dispersed population. They said, "If there was more money, they (MSL) could support competitive, innovative grants." Another person said, "We're in a global economy... I see Montana as 900,000 people competing with the rest of the world." This person went on to say that his community couldn't compete alone and that aggregating resources on a statewide basis was Montana's only hope for keeping up. The state's involvement in negotiating database licenses and the OCLC fixed-cost contract were praised as examples of positioning Montana to compete with the world.

The Montana State Library was praised for the decision to deploy technology consultants around the state. One person commented, "The statewide technology program and putting people in the field are the right things to do." Another said, "It pleased me greatly that the Montana State Library stationed those people outside of Helena." Several people said that providing LSTA funding for the three state technology consultants has had more impact than any other recent development. One director commented "We finally have somebody close to work with—somebody who's actually been to your library!" Another

said, "Having the technology consultant available has increased the value of the other money that we've already spent on technology."

There was some disagreement regarding the relatively recent dissolution of the LSTA Advisory Council. Some felt that it made sense to dissolve the body since there were few individual grants to review. However a few others disagreed and expressed an opinion that doing away with the Council wasn't a good idea because MSL needs broad input. Nevertheless, virtually all the interviewees indicated that they had a high level of trust in the State Library and particularly in the State Librarian. One said, "The State Librarian provides good direction; she's focused." Another said, "The State Librarian is absolutely the best communicator, administrator, and process implementor I have ever known."

Some of the interviewees expressed concern over the Montana Library Network's goal of a statewide catalog. One individual said, "We don't need a statewide catalog to tell us that there aren't many resources in Montana." This person indicated that using state dollars to support interlibrary loan activity (specifically an interlibrary loan clerical position at the Billings library) would be meaningful to many small and medium-sized libraries. Another felt that the State Library didn't fully understand the relatively simple automation needs of small libraries. This person also worried that the cost of the OCLC fixed-price contract would eventually increase to the point where many libraries would find participation unaffordable.

MLN was, on the one hand, praised for being visionary, while, on the other hand, it was criticized for lacking in details. "We won't be joining the MLN shared catalog project; we're concerned about the loss of population and tax-base in our service area and we're afraid that we won't be able to sustain membership if we joined." One person expressed the worry that, "they haven't been able to tell us how much some of these things will cost in the long run." Nevertheless, some people declared their strong support for the shared catalog concept and urged continuing support for all aspects of the MLN program. One director commented wryly that "MSL does a beautiful job... we're really unfair to them... we whine and they respond and give it to us and then we cry uncle!"

APPENDIX C

Montana Libraries Survey Summary

In June of 2001, the Montana library community was offered an opportunity to offer their opinions on a number of issues and topics of importance that had been identified through a series of focus group discussions and interviews held during the previous month. There were actually three surveys: one for public library directors; one for academic, special, and institution librarians; and one for school library/media center personnel. Wherever practical, the wording of the survey questions was identical; however, the consultants explored certain areas in greater detail with representatives of the public libraries since this is an audience for which the Montana State Library has statutory responsibilities.

The surveys were originally scheduled to be conducted by mail, however, the urgency created by the impending end of the school year made it advisable to conduct the school and academic surveys via the Internet. The existence of the web surveys was announced on the Wired Montana listserv and a "hot-link" to the surveys was provided to facilitate easy access. Librarians and interested staff from all parts of the state were invited to participate. The survey of public libraries was mailed to the director of each of the legal libraries in Montana and a web version of the survey was provided as an alternate means of participation.

Limitations of the Web Surveys

Since participation in the web surveys to school, academic, special, and institution libraries was open to anyone who, having learned of the web-site, chose to complete the survey, the responses do not represent a scientific sampling of those Montana library communities. Therefore, survey results cannot be generalized to all Montana school, academic, special, and institutional libraries. Furthermore, it should be noted that it is likely that multiple people from some libraries or organizations responded to the survey. Therefore, the number of responses for a type of library does not necessarily represent the same number of libraries.

Nevertheless, the web survey results are valuable in that they provide another dimension in the array of data gathering techniques used and provide additional insight into how the Montana library community perceives the Montana State Library's performance. The survey results are best used in combination with information gathered from other sources such as the focus groups and/or interviews. The web survey serves as a mechanism that can be used to confirm or refute statements made by individuals, and to assess the strength of opinions and ideas expressed by those who participated in the interviews and focus groups.

Since the public library survey was sent to all public libraries, and since the response rate from these libraries was quite high (81.01%), the results of this survey can be construed as being a closer representation of the total population of Montana's 79 public libraries.

This summary is broken into multiple sections. The first provides a comparison of responses for all types of libraries. The other sections provide greater detail for each type of library separately.

Summary of All Types of Libraries

Who Responded to the Survey

Overall 161 responses to the surveys were received. Sixty-four public library directors, thirty-one academic, special, and institution librarians, and sixty-six school media/librarians responded. One hundred and nine of the responses came from libraries that said they participated in one of the six library federations. School libraries were the least likely to claim association with a federation.

As a whole, the survey respondents tended to be library directors of libraries with staff of two or less Full-Time-Equivalents (FTEs). The materials and online resources budgets of the majority of school library/media centers tended to be in the \$ 1,001 to \$ 10,000 range and most public libraries fell into the range between \$ 1,001 and \$ 20,000. At the other end of the spectrum, the highest percent of the academic libraries and two of the special libraries reported materials and online resources budgets of over \$100,000. Seven public libraries also reported collection budgets over \$ 100,000.

Contact with the Montana State Library

Survey respondents were asked to indicate which departments or programs of the Montana State Library they had contacted in the past year. The Montana Library Network (MLN) was the Montana State Library program most likely to have been contacted by all types of libraries. MLN was followed by the Library and Information Services Department. As might be anticipated, public librarians were far more likely to have contacted the Library Development Department (60.94%) than librarians from other types of libraries. Again, not surprisingly, Public library contact was also highest with the Talking Book Library (59.38%) although some school, academic, institutional and even some special libraries indicated contact with this program.

Contact with the Natural Resources Information System (NRIS) office was highest among academic libraries (50.00% for four-year public colleges and universities and for two-year community colleges). Interestingly, none of the private four-year campuses indicated any contact with NRIS. Almost thirty-six percent (35.94%) of public library respondents indicated that they had contact with NRIS during the last year.

Participation in Montana State Library and MLN Initiatives

High percents of respondents from all types of libraries said they subscribed to MLN full-text databases: Eighty-six percent (85.94%) of the public libraries, eighty-one percent (80.65%) of the academic, special, and institution libraries, and seventy percent (69.70%) of the school library/media centers. Participation in the shared catalog project was much lower: fifty-five percent (54.84%) of the academic, special, and institution libraries, thirty-four percent (34.38%) of the public libraries, and seventeen percent (16.67%) of the school library/media centers said they are participating in the project in some way. Ninety-two percent (92.19%) of the public libraries and seventy-seven percent (77.42%) of the academic, special, and institution libraries reporting said they participate in the OCLC fixed-cost contract. Less than seventeen percent (16.67%) of the school libraries said they participate in the OCLC contract.

Relative Importance of Continuing Education Providers

The Montana State Library was identified as the most important continuing education/staff development provider for the public libraries in the state. On a five-point scale, MSL averaged 4.57 in importance among the public library group. The Montana Library Association (MLA) ranked second for public libraries at 4.27. MLA was ranked as the most important continuing education provider by academic, special, institution and school librarians.

Importance of Various Continuing Education/Workshop Topics

The most important potential workshop topics for public and for academic, special, and institutional libraries were *Use of OCLC system(s)* (public - 4.46) (academic, special, institutional - 3.81) followed by *Use of MNL database project resources* (public - 4.08) (academic, special, institutional - 3.71). For the school library/media centers the most important topic was *Teaching library/information literacy skills* (4.64) followed by *Integrating technology/information literacy into the curriculum* (4.58). Academic libraries rated the closely related *Information literacy/Bibliographic Instruction* category a close third at 3.68. *Teaching information literacy skills* lagged behind *Trustee training*, *Basic library management skills*, *Collection development*, and *Internet searching skills* as a topic for continuing education.

Tolerable Travel Time to Continuing Education Events

The highest percents of responses on all the surveys indicated participants were willing to travel between one and one-half to two hours to attend a typical half-day training event. The second highest percent of public library and academic, special, and institution library participants were willing to travel over two hours. Among the school library/media

center respondents the second highest percent was for one to one and one-half hours of travel time.

The surveys asked participants which of a number of current or potential services the Montana State Library might provide would be most helpful to them. Respondents on all three surveys gave workshops and continuing education opportunities their highest ratings.

Participants were also asked to identify the most important role(s) for the Montana State Library in relation to their library. Public library directors gave their highest ratings (tied) for *Legislative advocacy* and for *Securing direct State aid for local libraries*. The surveys for school library/media centers and for academic, special, and institution libraries included a statement which said “Given that the Montana State Library has no statutory responsibility for (your type of) libraries, which of the following do you consider the single most appropriate role for the Montana State Library?” Among the academic, special, and institution libraries the role receiving the highest percent was *Setting a vision for Montana libraries*. Among the school library/media center responses the highest percent was for *Providing group database licensing*.

A more detailed treatment of each of the surveys follows:

Public Library Survey Summary

A survey was mailed to all seventy-nine public library directors in the state; responses were received from sixty-four, or eighty-one percent (81.01%). All but one of the libraries (98.44%) reported that they participated in a federation. The most responses (17 or 77% of the public libraries in that federation) came from the Broad Valleys Federation, but the directors of at least seventy-three percent (73.3%) of the legal public libraries in each of the federations responded to the survey.

The highest percent of responses came from directors of libraries with one to two FTE staff:

<i>Staff Size</i>	<i>Percent of responses</i>	<i># of Responses</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	15.63%	10
1.00 FTE	9.38%	6
1.01-2.00 FTE	32.81%	21
2.01-3.00 FTE	15.63%	10
3.01-5.00 FTE	12.50%	8
5.01-10.00 FTE	4.69%	3
10.01-20.00 FTE	1.56%	1
Over 20 FTE	7.81%	5

(Note that there were so few libraries in each of the categories of 1.00 FTE, 5.01-10.00 FTE, 10.01-20.00 FTE and over 20 FTE that using percents in the comparisons of

responses below would tend to exaggerate differences. Sometimes numbers of responses are used instead of percents in the text below.)

Of the sixty-four responses, the largest group (26.56%) had a materials and online resources budget of \$1,001-\$5,000. Over half (56.25%) had a materials and online resources budget of \$10,000 or less. Nearly eight percent (7.81%) had a materials and online resources budget of under \$1,000. Only eleven percent (10.94%) had a materials and online resources budget of \$100,001-\$200,000.

The directors were asked with which of the departments of the Montana State Library (MSL) they had had direct contact or had referred their users to in the past year. Over eighty-four percent (84.38%) had contacted the Montana Library Network.

<i>MSL Department</i>	<i>Percent having contacted MSL Dept.</i>
Montana Library Network (MLN)	84.38%
Library and Information Services (LISD)	76.56%
Library Development (LDD)	60.94%
Talking Books Library (TBL)	59.38%
Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)	35.94%

The libraries with the smallest staffs contacted LISD most. Libraries with five to ten FTEs were evenly divided in their contacts with LISD, MLN, and TBL. Libraries with staffs that ranged from one to five FTEs had the highest percents of contacts with MLN.

<i>Library by Staff Size</i>	<i>MSL Department Contacted By Highest Percent</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	LISD
1.00 FTE	LISD
1.01-2.00 FTE	MLN
2.01-3.00 FTE	MLN
3.01-5.00 FTE	MLN
5.01-10.00 FTE	LISD, MLN, TBL (all contacted by all 3 libraries in this category size)
10.01-20.00 FTE	All cited by one library
Over 20 FTE	LDD and MLN

Nearly eighty-six percent (85.94%) of the libraries subscribe to the full-text magazine databases offered by the State Library. Those that do not subscribe do not because of lack of funds, being unaware of the project or some other individually stated reason. Three library directors gave each of these answers. Of those nine negative responses, seven said they did not anticipate subscribing to the databases within the next one to three years.

Only thirty-four percent (34.38%) said their library participated in the MLN shared catalog project. The major reason given for not participating was lack of funds. Almost sixty percent (59.52%) of those not participating gave this reason. There were also a

number of additional reasons provided by the respondents: four said they were planning to join in the future; two said it seemed redundant; one said it would increase their net lender subsidy costs, and another called it a “waste of time, a pet rock project.” Two-thirds (66.67%) of those not participating said they did not anticipate participating in the next one to three years.

On the other hand, over ninety-two percent (92.19%) said their library did participate in the OCLC fixed-cost contract. Of the five who did not participate, three said their reason for not participating was the lack of funds. Two said they did anticipate participating in the coming one to three years.

The directors were asked to rate the relative importance of a number of providers of continuing education/staff development workshops and programs for their staff. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the providers in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

<i>CE Provider</i>	<i>Relative mean score</i>
Montana State Library	4.57
Montana Library Association	4.27
In-house training	4.05
Regional library federation	4.03

Eight directors listed other providers they believed important. Examples were videos of workshops provided by several of those listed and local educational institutions and vendors.

The highest percent of directors from libraries with less than one FTE (80.00%) said the Regional library federations were very important (the highest rating). The highest percent from libraries with one FTE went to in-house training (83.33%). The highest percent from directors of libraries with one to two, two to three, and three to five FTEs went to the Montana State Library. Four of the five directors from libraries with over twenty FTEs gave their highest rating to the Montana Library Association.

<i>Library by Staff Size</i>	<i>Provider Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	Regional library federation
1.00 FTE	In-house training
1.01-2.00 FTE	Montana State Library
2.01-3.00 FTE	Montana State Library
3.01-5.00 FTE	Montana State Library
5.01-10.00 FTE	Montana State Library
10.01-20.00 FTE	All providers were rated Important
Over 20 FTE	Montana Library Association

The directors were also asked to rate the relative importance of a number of topics for potential workshops in terms of their importance to the director and his/her staff. The

chart below shows the relative mean scores of the topics in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Relative mean score</i>
Use of OCLC system(s)	4.46
Use of MLN database project resources	4.08
Trustee training	3.98
Basic library management skills	3.84
Collection development	3.80
Internet searching skills	3.77
Teaching library/information literacy skills	3.55
Creating web pages	3.14

<i>Library by Staff Size</i>	<i>Topic Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	Use of OCLC system(s)
1.00 FTE	Internet searching skills
1.01-2.00 FTE	Use of OCLC system(s)
2.01-3.00 FTE	Basic library management skills, and Use of OCLC system(s) (tie)
3.01-5.00 FTE	Use of OCLC system(s), Trustee training
5.01-10.00 FTE	(only 3 libraries responding in this category)
10.01-20.00 FTE	(only 1 library responding in this category)
Over 20 FTE	(only 5 libraries responding—no patterns)

Over thirty-four percent (34.38%) said they were willing to travel for one and one-half to two hours for a typical half-day training event. Typically, directors from libraries with less than one FTE clustered in the thirty minutes to one and one-half hours categories; those in the one to two FTE group were willing to travel between one and two hours, as were those in the three to five FTE group.

The directors were asked to rate a number of services either provided or potentially to be provided by the State Library in terms of the degree to which they are or would be helpful to the respondent's library. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the services in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

<i>Potential service</i>	<i>Relative mean score</i>
Providing staff continuing education	4.59
Technology consulting and assistance	4.56
Group database licensing	4.38
Interlibrary loan net-lender reimbursement	4.19
Grant/funding development assistance	4.19
General library consulting services	4.17
Providing trustee continuing education	3.89
Back-up reference service	3.66
Facilities consulting	3.28

<i>Library by staff size</i>	<i>Service Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	Providing staff continuing education
1.00 FTE	Providing staff continuing education
1.01-2.00 FTE	Technology consulting and assistance
2.01-3.00 FTE	Providing staff continuing education, Technology consulting and assistance
3.01-5.00 FTE	Group database licensing
5.01-10.00 FTE	Group database licensing
10.01-20.00 FTE	General library consulting services, Interlibrary loan net-lender reimbursement
Over 20 FTE	Group database licensing

The directors were asked to rate the importance of a number of roles for the Montana State Library. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the roles in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

<i>MSL role</i>	<i>Relative mean score</i>
Legislative advocacy	4.70
Securing direct State aid for local libraries	4.70
Coordinating/providing continuing education	4.67
Providing expert consulting services	4.57
Increasing public awareness of libraries	4.42
Providing direct services to residents with special needs	4.33
Setting a vision for Montana libraries	4.22
Help in securing improved local funding	4.14
Providing information services to State government	3.97

<i>Library by Staff Size</i>	<i>Service Receiving Highest Percent of Very Important Rating</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	Legislative advocacy
1.00 FTE	Coordinating/providing continuing education, Securing direct State aid for local libraries
1.01-2.00 FTE	Coordinating/providing continuing education
2.01-3.00 FTE	Legislative advocacy, Securing direct State-aid for libraries
3.01-5.00 FTE	Securing direct State aid for local libraries
5.01-10.00 FTE	Legislative advocacy, Coordinating/providing continuing education
10.01-20.00 FTE	(only 1 library responding in this category)
Over 20 FTE	Legislative advocacy, Securing direct State aid for local libraries, Providing direct service to residents with special needs

Academic, Special, and Institutional Library Survey Summary

A survey of Montana academic, special and institution libraries was conducted via the Internet. Thirty-one responses were received. Over sixty percent (61.29%) of the respondents were library directors, but staff with other job titles in academic and special libraries also took part.

<i>Job title</i>	<i>Percent of responses</i>	
Director	61.29%	
Reference Librarian	16.13%	
Cataloger/Bibliographer	3.23%	(one person)
Bibliographic Instruction Librarian	3.23%	(one person)
Support staff	3.23%	(one person)
Some other designation	12.90%	

The responses were about evenly split in terms of federation participation: fifty-two percent (51.61%) were federation members; forty-eight percent (48.39%) were not. Nearly forty-four percent (43.75%) of the responses came from librarians in Broad Valleys Federation.

The highest percent of responses came from libraries with one to two FTE staff:

<i>Staff Size</i>	<i>Percent of responses</i>	<i># of Responses</i>
Less than 1.00 FTE	12.90%	4
1.00 FTE	6.45%	2
1.01-2.00 FTE	22.58%	7
2.01-3.00 FTE	19.35%	6
3.01-5.00 FTE	3.23%	1
5.01-10.00 FTE	19.35%	6
10.01-20.00 FTE	3.23%	1
Over 20 FTE	12.90%	4

Of the thirty-one responses, nearly thirty-seven percent (36.67%) had a materials and online resources budget of over \$100,000.

The number of each type of library represented by those who responded to the survey is relatively small and does not lend itself to generalizing about all of that type of library in Montana. If the three types of academic libraries are combined, the resulting number, fifteen, represents over half (55.6%) of the academic libraries in Montana. However, it is also possible that multiple responses came from the same academic library and that there are fewer than fifteen academic libraries represented. Consequently the text that follows analyzes responses from the overall perspective of Montana academic and special libraries. (The charts included with the report do give the responses broken into the various types of libraries represented.)

<i>Type of library</i>	<i>Number of responses</i>
4 yr. Public University or College	8
4 yr. Private University or College	4
2 yr. Community/Technical College	3
Hospital/Health Science Library	6
Other Special Library	6
Institutional Library	1

The survey asked with which of the departments of the Montana State Library (MSL) the respondents had had direct contact or had referred their users to in the past year. Over ninety percent (90.32%) had contacted the Montana Library Network

<i>MSL Department</i>	<i>Percent having contacted MSL Dept.</i>
Montana Library Network (MLN)	90.32%
Library and Information Services (LISD)	67.74%
Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)	38.71%
Library Development (LDD)	29.03%
Talking Books Library (TBL)	22.58%

Over eighty percent (80.65%) said their library participated in the MLN database project. Of the six that did not participate, two said lack of funds was their main reason for not participating and they did not anticipate participating in the next one to three years. (That represents all eight 4 year public universities and all four 4 year private universities responding to the survey.)

Over half (54.84%) said their library participated in the MLN shared catalog project. Of those whose library did not participate, four cited lack of funds, three said their bibliographic records were not machine-readable, and six had a reason specific to their institution. Only two said they anticipated joining the shared catalog project in the next three years.

Over three-quarters (77.42%) said their library participated in the MLN OCLC fixed-cost contract. (That represents all eight 4 year public universities, all four 4 year private universities, and all three 2 year community/technical colleges responding to the survey.) Of the seven who are not participating, four cited lack of funds and three gave a reason specific to their institution. None expected to begin participating in the next three years.

Over half (51.61%) cited the Montana Library Association as the continuing education/staff development workshop provider that most benefited them and their staff. Nine who cited "other" in response to this question gave the Special Libraries Association or the National Library of Medicine or a combination of sources as their most important provider.

Nearly twenty percent (19.35%) said their library had applied for an LSTA "Montaniana" digitization grant. The major reason for not applying for such a grant was the lack of significant collections to digitize, which was cited by twelve of the 25 (48.00%) who had

not applied. Some of the other reasons given were being new to the position, having missed the deadline, or doing their own digitization project.

The survey asked respondents to rate the relative importance of a number of topics for potential workshops in terms of their importance to them. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the topics in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Relative mean score</i>
Use of OCLC system(s)	3.81
Use of MLN database project resources	3.71
Information literacy/bibliographic instruction	3.68
Cooperative collection development	3.55
Creating web pages	3.33
Internet searching skills	3.26

Five respondents gave some other topic such as managing a one to two staff library and collaboration skills and techniques and gave that topic a 5 or a 4 rating.

Over seventy-four percent (74.19%) said they were willing to travel one and a half hours or more hours for a typical half-day training event. Thirty-nine percent (38.71%) were willing to travel one and a half to two hours; another thirty-five percent (35.48%) said they were willing to travel over two hours.

The survey asked which of the following services would be most helpful to your library? The choices provided were technology technical assistance, library management consulting, and workshops/continuing education opportunities. Twenty responses, representing nearly sixty-five percent (64.52%) were for workshops/continuing education opportunities.

The next question asked, "Given that the Montana State Library has no statutory responsibility for academic, special, or institution libraries, which of the following do you consider the single most appropriate role for the Montana State Library?" Nearly forty-two percent (41.94%) indicated the most important role setting a vision for Montana libraries. Nineteen percent (19.35%) said the most important role was including all types of libraries in resource sharing planning. Almost thirteen percent (12.90%) indicated the most important role was database licensing. All other roles received under ten percent.

School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

A survey of Montana school library and media centers was conducted via the Internet. Sixty-six responses were received. Over seventy percent (71.21%) of the respondents were library/media center directors, but staff with other job titles also took part.

Less than half, only forty-five percent (45.45%), of the respondents said their library/media center participated in a federation. The federation with the highest percent

of participants in the survey was Tamarack, with forty-one percent (41.38%) of the participants.

While there was at least one response in each of the staff size categories (the largest being over ten FTE), the highest percents came in the smaller staff size categories. Forty-three percent (43.08%) of the responses came from school media people who worked in settings with one FTE paid staff in the media center. Twenty-five percent (24.62%) were in media centers with 1.01-2.00 FTE. Another fifteen percent (15.38%) were in media centers with less than 1.00 FTE.

Of the sixty-six responses, nearly forty-four percent (43.94%) came from school media center staff personnel who had a materials and online resources budget of \$1,001 to \$5,000. Over seventy-seven percent (77.27) had a materials and online resources budget of \$10,000 or less, but none had a budget of less than \$1,000 for these resources. Only one respondent said she/he had a materials budget of \$35,001-\$50,000 and one other said her/his materials budget was over \$50,000.

The respondents were asked with which of the departments of the Montana State Library (MSL) they had had direct contact or had referred their users to in the past year. Over seventy-two percent (72.73%) had contacted the Montana Library Network.

<i>MSL Department</i>	<i>Percent having contacted MSL Dept.</i>
Montana Library Network (MLN)	72.73%
Library and Information Services (LISD)	31.82%
Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)	22.73%
Talking Books Library (TBL)	15.15%
None of the departments	13.64%
Library Development (LDD)	6.06%

Nearly seventy percent (69.70%) subscribed to the full-text magazine databases offered through the MLN. Of the twenty who did not subscribe, thirty-five percent (35.00%) said they were unaware of the project and another thirty percent (30.00%) said they lacked the funds to do so. Only four, or twenty percent (20.00%), said they anticipated subscribing to the program in the coming three years.

Almost seventeen percent (16.67%) said their school media center participated in a shared catalog program. Of the fifty-five who said they did not participate, thirty-six percent (36.36%) said they lacked funds to participate. Another thirty-five percent (34.55%) cited other reasons, which they provided. Several examples were related to not participating in ILL, being a part of their own district's database rather than a larger database, and being unable to see the advantage to participation. Two said they needed more information. Thirteen percent (12.73%) said they were unaware of the project. Of the fifty-five, only eighteen or thirty-three percent (32.73%), anticipated joining the project in the coming three years.

Almost sixty percent (59.62%) said the continuing education provider that was most useful to them was the Montana Library Association. In second place with nineteen percent (19.23%) was the local school district; the Montana State Library was in third place with seventeen percent (17.31%).

The survey asked respondents to rate the relative importance of a number of topics for potential workshops/training sessions. The chart below shows the relative mean scores of the topics in descending order. (5=Very Important; 3=the midpoint of the scale)

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Relative mean score</i>
Teaching library/information literacy skills	4.64
Integrating technology/information literacy into the curriculum	4.58
Internet searching skills	4.09
Use of MLN database project resources	4.02
Collection development	3.73
Creating web pages	3.30

Five gave specific topics and gave those a score of four or five. Some examples were how to integrate new standards into the curriculum, technical services training, and digital libraries and e-books.

Sixty-two percent (62.3%) said they were willing to travel between one and two hours for a typical half-day training event. Nearly thirty-three percent (32.79%) said they would travel one and a half to two hours.

Seventy percent (69.70%) said the most helpful thing the State Library could do for their media center was provide workshops and continuing education opportunities. One suggestion added as “other” was to provide a collection of professional school library materials that could be shared statewide through ILL.

The next question asked, “Given that the Montana State Library has no statutory responsibility for school libraries, which of the following do you consider the single most appropriate role for the Montana State Library?” The choices provided were legislative advocacy, including schools in planning for resource sharing, providing better visibility for school library/media centers, providing continuing education/staff development, and providing group database licensing. Forty-two percent (41.54%) said providing group database licensing was most important. Another twenty percent (20.00%) said including schools in planning for resource sharing, and another fifteen percent (15.38%) said legislative advocacy.

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Participate in a federation?																		
Yes	63	98.44%	10	100.00%	5	83.33%	21	100.00%	10	100.00%	8	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%
No	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Which federation?																		
Broad Valleys	17	26.56%	3	30.00%	3	50.00%	3	14.29%	4	40.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
Golden Plains	5	7.81%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	14.29%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Pathfinder	11	17.19%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	3	14.29%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Sagebrush	10	15.63%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	3	14.29%	2	20.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
South Central	11	17.19%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	5	23.81%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Tamarack	10	15.63%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	19.05%	1	10.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
Contact with which departments/programs?																		
Library and Information Services	49	76.56%	6	60.00%	5	83.33%	17	80.95%	6	60.00%	7	87.50%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	4	80.00%
Library Development	39	60.94%	4	40.00%	3	50.00%	14	66.67%	4	40.00%	6	75.00%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%
Montana Library Network	54	84.38%	5	50.00%	4	66.67%	19	90.48%	9	90.00%	8	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%
Talking Books Library	38	59.38%	2	20.00%	4	66.67%	13	61.90%	5	50.00%	6	75.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	4	80.00%
Natural Resources Information System	23	35.94%	1	10.00%	3	50.00%	8	38.10%	4	40.00%	2	25.00%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
None of the Above	3	4.69%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Subscribe to database program?																		
Yes	55	85.94%	7	70.00%	3	50.00%	19	90.48%	9	90.00%	8	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%
No	9	14.06%	3	30.00%	3	50.00%	2	9.52%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Reason for NOT subscribing																		
Lack of funds	3	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of Internet access	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of project	3	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	3	33.33%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate subscribing in next 1 - 3 years?																		
Yes	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	7	77.78%	3	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Participate in shared catalog program?																		
Yes	22	34.38%	1	10.00%	4	66.67%	7	33.33%	2	20.00%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	3	60.00%
No	42	65.63%	9	90.00%	2	33.33%	14	66.67%	8	80.00%	4	50.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
Reason for NOT participating																		
Lack of funds	25	59.52%	5	55.56%	2	100.00%	10	71.43%	6	75.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	1	2.38%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Bibliographic records not machine-readable	5	11.90%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	3	21.43%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Concern over becoming net lender	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Prefer autonomous system	2	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%
Unaware of the project	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	9	21.43%	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%
Anticipate participating in next 1 - 3 years?																		
Yes	14	33.33%	3	33.33%	0	0.00%	6	42.86%	2	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	28	66.67%	6	66.67%	2	100.00%	8	57.14%	6	75.00%	3	75.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%
Participate in OCLC fixed-cost contract?																		
Yes	59	92.19%	8	80.00%	5	83.33%	21	100.00%	8	80.00%	8	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%
No	5	7.81%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Reason for NOT participating																		
Lack of funds	3	60.00%	1	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	1	20.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of project	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate participating in next 1 - 3 years?																		
Yes	2	40.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	3	60.00%	1	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No Response	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Importance of continuing education providers																		
In-house training																		
1 - Very Unimportant	6	9.38%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	3	14.29%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	8	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	1	10.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	13	20.31%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	3	14.29%	3	30.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
5 - Very Important	33	51.56%	5	50.00%	5	83.33%	10	47.62%	5	50.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	3	60.00%
No Response	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	4.05																	
Median =	5.00																	
Regional library federation																		
1 - Very Unimportant	3	4.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	3	4.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
3	11	17.19%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	1	4.76%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	3	60.00%
4	19	29.69%	2	20.00%	2	33.33%	8	38.10%	3	30.00%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	28	43.75%	8	80.00%	2	33.33%	10	47.62%	4	40.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Mean =	4.03																	
Median =	4.00																	
Montana Library Association																		
1 - Very Unimportant	4	6.25%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	5	7.81%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	15	23.44%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	7	33.33%	3	30.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Very Important	38	59.38%	6	60.00%	2	33.33%	12	57.14%	6	60.00%	6	75.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	4	80.00%
Mean =	4.27																	
Median =	4.00																	
Montana State Library																		
1 - Very Unimportant	2	3.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	2	3.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	15	23.44%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	4	19.05%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
5 - Very Important	44	68.75%	6	60.00%	4	66.67%	15	71.43%	7	70.00%	7	87.50%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
No Response	1	1.56%	1	10.00%														
Mean =	4.57																	
Median =	5.00																	
Other																		
1 - Very Unimportant	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%
4	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%
5 - Very Important	4	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

Mean =	4.25																	
Median =	4.50																	
	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Importance of continuing education topics																		
Basic library management skills																		
1 - Very Unimportant	6	9.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
2	2	3.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	16	25.00%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	3	14.29%	4	40.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	3	60.00%
4	12	18.75%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	6	28.57%	1	10.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	28	43.75%	5	50.00%	4	66.67%	10	47.62%	5	50.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.84																	
Median =	4.00																	
Collection development																		
1 - Very Unimportant	4	6.25%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	2	3.13%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	18	28.13%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	7	33.33%	4	40.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
4	19	29.69%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	8	38.10%	2	20.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
5 - Very Important	21	32.81%	4	40.00%	4	66.67%	5	23.81%	4	40.00%	2	25.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.80																	
Median =	4.00																	
Internet searching skills																		
1 - Very Unimportant	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	9	14.06%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
3	14	21.88%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	8	38.10%	2	20.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	20	31.25%	6	60.00%	0	0.00%	6	28.57%	3	30.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Very Important	20	31.25%	2	20.00%	5	83.33%	6	28.57%	4	40.00%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Mean =	3.77																	
Median =	4.00																	
Creating web pages																		
1 - Very Unimportant	6	9.38%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	9	14.06%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	3	14.29%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
3	27	42.19%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	9	42.86%	6	60.00%	4	50.00%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
4	14	21.88%	2	20.00%	3	50.00%	4	19.05%	1	10.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	8	12.50%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.14																	
Median =	3.00																	
Teaching library/information literacy skills																		
1 - Very Unimportant	4	6.25%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
2	7	10.94%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
3	17	26.56%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	6	28.57%	3	30.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	22	34.38%	3	30.00%	4	66.67%	8	38.10%	1	10.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Very Important	14	21.88%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	6	28.57%	4	40.00%	1	12.50%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.55																	
Median =	4.00																	
Use of OCLC system(s)																		
1 - Very Unimportant	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	7	10.94%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	1	4.76%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
4	16	25.00%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	6	28.57%	3	30.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Very Important	39	60.94%	7	70.00%	4	66.67%	14	66.67%	5	50.00%	5	62.50%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
No Response	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

	Mean =	4.46																		
	Median =	5.00																		
	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE		
Use of MLN database project resources																				
1 - Very Unimportant	3	4.84%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
2	1	1.61%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
3	9	14.52%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	3	15.00%	2	20.00%	1	14.29%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
4	24	38.71%	4	40.00%	3	50.00%	10	50.00%	2	20.00%	2	28.57%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%		
5 - Very Important	25	40.32%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	7	35.00%	5	50.00%	4	57.14%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%		
No Response	1	1.61%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
	Mean =	4.08																		
	Median =	4.00																		
Trustee training																				
1 - Very Unimportant	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
2	6	9.38%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
3	10	15.63%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	5	23.81%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
4	18	28.13%	1	10.00%	2	33.33%	5	23.81%	5	50.00%	1	12.50%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%		
5 - Very Important	27	42.19%	4	40.00%	3	50.00%	9	42.86%	3	30.00%	5	62.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%		
No Response	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
	Mean =	3.98																		
	Median =	4.00																		
Acceptable travel time to training																				
less than 30 minutes	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
30 - 60 minutes	9	14.06%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	2	9.52%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
1 hour - 1 1/2 hours	16	25.00%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	5	23.81%	3	30.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
1 1/2 hours to 2 hours	22	34.38%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	10	47.62%	3	30.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%		
Over 2 hours	17	26.56%	2	20.00%	2	33.33%	4	19.05%	2	20.00%	2	25.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	3	60.00%		
Helpfulness of services																				
Providing continuing education for staff																				
1 - Least Helpful	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
2	2	3.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%		
3	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
4	14	21.88%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	7	33.33%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%		
5 - Most Helpful	46	71.88%	8	80.00%	6	100.00%	14	66.67%	8	80.00%	6	75.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
	Mean =	4.59																		
	Median =	5.00																		
Providing continuing education for trustees																				
1 - Least Helpful	3	4.69%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
2	5	7.81%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
3	14	21.88%	2	20.00%	2	33.33%	3	14.29%	3	30.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
4	16	25.00%	1	10.00%	3	50.00%	8	38.10%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
5 - Most Helpful	26	40.63%	5	50.00%	1	16.67%	8	38.10%	3	30.00%	4	50.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%		
	Mean =	3.89																		
	Median =	4.00																		
Technology consulting & assistance																				
1 - Least Helpful	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
2	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%		
3	4	6.25%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%		
4	14	21.88%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	6	28.57%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%		
5 - Most Helpful	44	68.75%	7	70.00%	5	83.33%	15	71.43%	8	80.00%	7	87.50%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%		
	Mean =	4.56																		
	Median =	5.00																		

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Back-up reference service																		
1 - Least Helpful	3	4.69%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
2	13	20.31%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	1	4.76%	2	20.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	3	60.00%
3	8	12.50%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	15	23.44%	2	20.00%	2	33.33%	6	28.57%	3	30.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Helpful	22	34.38%	4	40.00%	3	50.00%	8	38.10%	3	30.00%	2	25.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No Response	3	4.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.66																	
Median =	4.00																	
Group database licensing																		
1 - Least Helpful	4	6.35%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	4	6.35%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	14	22.22%	1	10.00%	3	50.00%	8	38.10%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%
5 - Most Helpful	39	61.90%	4	40.00%	2	33.33%	11	52.38%	7	70.00%	8	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	3	75.00%
No Response	2	3.17%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	4.38																	
Median =	5.00																	
General library consulting services																		
1 - Least Helpful	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
3	11	17.19%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	4	19.05%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	20	31.25%	3	30.00%	4	66.67%	7	33.33%	3	30.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Most Helpful	30	46.88%	4	40.00%	1	16.67%	10	47.62%	4	40.00%	7	87.50%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
Mean =	4.17																	
Median =	4.00																	
Facilities consulting services																		
1 - Least Helpful	5	8.20%	3	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	9	14.75%	1	11.11%	2	33.33%	2	9.52%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
3	21	34.43%	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	10	47.62%	6	60.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	60.00%
4	16	26.23%	3	33.33%	3	50.00%	5	23.81%	1	10.00%	2	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Helpful	10	16.39%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	4	19.05%	1	10.00%	3	50.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.28																	
Median =	3.00																	
Interlibrary loan net-lender reimbursement																		
1 - Least Helpful	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	3	4.69%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	4.76%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	11	17.19%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	4	19.05%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
4	13	20.31%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	4	19.05%	3	30.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Most Helpful	35	54.69%	4	40.00%	4	66.67%	12	57.14%	3	30.00%	7	87.50%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
Mean =	4.19																	
Median =	5.00																	
Grant/funding development assistance																		
1 - Least Helpful	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	13	20.31%	2	20.00%	3	50.00%	2	9.52%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
4	17	26.56%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	8	38.10%	1	10.00%	4	50.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Helpful	30	46.88%	7	70.00%	1	16.67%	10	47.62%	6	60.00%	4	50.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
No Response	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Mean =	4.19																	
Median =	4.00																	

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Importance of roles for the Montana State Library																		
Legislative advocacy																		
1 - Least Important	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	4	6.25%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	8	12.50%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	5	23.81%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Important	51	79.69%	10	100.00%	3	50.00%	15	71.43%	8	80.00%	7	87.50%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%	4	80.00%
Mean =	4.70																	
Median =	5.00																	
Encouraging larger units of service																		
1 - Least Important	7	10.94%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	3	14.29%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
2	4	6.25%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	19.05%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	22	34.38%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	7	33.33%	6	60.00%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	16	25.00%	3	30.00%	4	66.67%	4	19.05%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Most Important	12	18.75%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	3	14.29%	2	20.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
No Response	3	4.69%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.36																	
Median =	3.00																	
Increasing public awareness of libraries																		
1 - Least Important	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	9	14.06%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	2	9.52%	1	10.00%	2	25.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
4	19	29.69%	3	30.00%	3	50.00%	7	33.33%	3	30.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Important	36	56.25%	7	70.00%	2	33.33%	12	57.14%	6	60.00%	3	37.50%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	3	60.00%
Mean =	4.42																	
Median =	5.00																	
Coordinating and providing continuing education																		
1 - Least Important	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	14	21.88%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	3	14.29%	3	30.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	3	60.00%
5 - Most Important	48	75.00%	8	80.00%	5	83.33%	18	85.71%	7	70.00%	6	75.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Mean =	4.67																	
Median =	5.00																	
Providing expert consulting services																		
1 - Least Important	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	5	7.81%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
4	14	21.88%	1	10.00%	1	16.67%	6	28.57%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
5 - Most Important	43	67.19%	7	70.00%	4	66.67%	15	71.43%	7	70.00%	6	75.00%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	1	20.00%
No Response	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	4.57																	
Median =	5.00																	
Securing direct State-aid for libraries																		
1 - Least Important	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	2	3.13%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	8	12.50%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	4	19.05%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Important	52	81.25%	7	70.00%	5	83.33%	17	80.95%	8	80.00%	8	100.00%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	4	80.00%
Mean =	4.70																	
Median =	5.00																	

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Helping to secure improved local funding																		
1 - Least Important	4	6.25%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
2	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	12	18.75%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	4	19.05%	2	20.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	11	17.19%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Most Important	35	54.69%	6	60.00%	4	66.67%	12	57.14%	5	50.00%	4	50.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
No Response	1	1.56%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	4.14																	
Median =	5.00																	
Setting a vision for Montana libraries																		
1 - Least Important	2	3.17%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	1.59%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	11	17.46%	1	10.00%	4	66.67%	4	20.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
4	16	25.40%	3	30.00%	1	16.67%	6	30.00%	3	30.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Most Important	33	52.38%	5	50.00%	1	16.67%	10	50.00%	5	50.00%	6	75.00%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	3	60.00%
Mean =	4.22																	
Median =	5.00																	
Providing direct service to residents with special needs																		
1 - Least Important	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	11	17.19%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	4	40.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
4	18	28.13%	2	20.00%	3	50.00%	8	38.10%	0	0.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
5 - Most Important	34	53.13%	5	50.00%	3	50.00%	11	52.38%	5	50.00%	4	50.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	4	80.00%
Mean =	4.33																	
Median =	5.00																	
Providing information services to State government																		
1 - Least Important	2	3.13%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	5	7.81%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	1	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
3	10	15.63%	2	20.00%	4	66.67%	0	0.00%	2	20.00%	1	12.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	19	29.69%	2	20.00%	1	16.67%	9	42.86%	2	20.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	2	40.00%
5 - Most Important	24	37.50%	4	40.00%	0	0.00%	8	38.10%	4	40.00%	5	62.50%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
No Response	4	6.25%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	2	9.52%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
Mean =	3.97																	
Median =	4.00																	
Number of paid staff																		
Less than 1.00 FTE	10	15.63%																
1.00 FTE	6	9.38%																
1.01 - 2.00 FTE	21	32.81%																
2.01 - 3.00 FTE	10	15.63%																
3.01 - 5.00 FTE	8	12.50%																
5.01 - 10.00 FTE	3	4.69%																
10.01 - 20.00 FTE	1	1.56%																
Over 20 FTE	5	7.81%																
	All Responses	% of all responses	Less than 1.00 FTE	% less than 1.00 FTE	1.00 FTE	% 1.00 FTE	1.01 - 2.00 FTE	% 1.01 - 2.00 FTE	2.01 - 3.00 FTE	% 2.01 - 3.00 FTE	3.01 - 5.00 FTE	% 3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5.01 - 10.00 FTE	% 5.01 - 10.00 FTE	10.01 - 20.00 FTE	% 10.01 - 20.00 FTE	Over 20 FTE	% Over 20 FTE
Materials and online resources budget																		

Montana Public Library Survey Summary

Under \$ 1,000	5	7.81%	3	30.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 1,001 - \$ 5,000	17	26.56%	5	50.00%	4	66.67%	6	28.57%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000	14	21.88%	2	20.00%	0	0.00%	9	42.86%	3	30.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000	13	20.31%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	3	30.00%	4	50.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000	7	10.94%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	2	20.00%	3	37.50%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 50,001 - \$ 75,000	1	1.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 75,001 - \$ 100,000	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 100,001 - \$ 200,000	7	10.94%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	5	100.00%
Over \$ 200,000	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Montana Academic/Special/Institutional Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	4 Yr. Public University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Public University or College	4 Yr. Private University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Private University or College	2 Yr. Community or Technical College Response	% 2 Yr. Community or Technical College	Hospital/ Health Science Library Response	% Hospital/Health Science Library	Other Special Library Response	% Other Special Library	Institutional Library Response	% Institutional Library	Other	% Other
Participate in a federation?																
Yes	16	51.61%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	4	66.67%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
No	15	48.39%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	3	100.00%	2	33.33%	4	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Which federation?																
Broad Valleys	7	43.75%	1	25.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	2	100.00%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
Golden Plains	1	6.25%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
Pathfinder	2	12.50%	1	25.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Sagebrush	2	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
South Central	1	6.25%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Tamarack	3	18.75%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Contact with which departments/programs?																
Library and Information Services	21	67.74%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	3	100.00%	4	66.67%	4	66.67%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
Library Development	9	29.03%	4	50.00%	1	25.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Montana Library Network	28	90.32%	7	87.50%	4	100.00%	3	100.00%	5	83.33%	5	83.33%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
Talking Books Library	7	22.58%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
Natural Resources Information System	12	38.71%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	5	83.33%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
None of the Above	1	3.23%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Subscribe to database program?																
Yes	25	80.65%	8	100.00%	4	100.00%	2	66.67%	5	83.33%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
No	6	19.35%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	1	16.67%	4	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Reason for NOT subscribing																
Lack of funds	2	40.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of Internet access	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of project	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	3	60.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate subscribing in next 1 - 3 years?																
Yes	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	2	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Participate in shared catalog program?																
Yes	17	54.84%	7	87.50%	3	75.00%	2	66.67%	2	33.33%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
No	14	45.16%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	1	33.33%	4	66.67%	5	83.33%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%

Montana Academic/Special/Institutional Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	4 Yr. Public University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Public University or College	4 Yr. Private University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Private University or College	2 Yr. Community or Technical College Response	% 2 Yr. Community or Technical College	Hospital/ Health Science Library Response	% Hospital/Health Science Library	Other Special Library Response	% Other Special Library	Institutional Library Response	% Institutional Library	Other	% Other
Reason for NOT participating																
Lack of funds	4	28.57%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Lack of time	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Bibliographic records not machine-readable	3	21.43%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	2	40.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unable to share resources	1	7.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Concern over becoming net lender	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of the project	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Prefer autonomous system	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	6	42.86%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	2	50.00%	2	40.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate participating in next 1 - 3 years?																
Yes	2	14.29%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	12	85.71%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%	4	100.00%	4	80.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Participate in OCLC fixed-cost contract?																
Yes	24	77.42%	8	100.00%	4	100.00%	3	100.00%	3	50.00%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
No	7	22.58%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	50.00%	4	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Reason for NOT participating																
Lack of funds	4	57.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of project	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	3	42.86%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate participating in next 1 - 3 years?																
Yes	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	7	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	4	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Most beneficial continuing education provider																
Parent organization	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Multitype library federation	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
University of Montana	1	3.23%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Montana State University	2	6.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
Montana Library Association	16	51.61%	6	75.00%	2	50.00%	2	66.67%	1	16.67%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	2	66.67%
Montana State Library	3	9.68%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	9	29.03%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	4	66.67%	3	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Has your library applied for a Montaniana digitization grant?																
Yes	6	19.35%	5	62.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	25	80.65%	3	37.50%	3	75.00%	3	100.00%	6	100.00%	6	100.00%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%

Montana Academic/Special/Institutional Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	4 Yr. Public University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Public University or College	4 Yr. Private University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Private University or College	2 Yr. Community or Technical College Response	% 2 Yr. Community or Technical College	Hospital/ Health Science Library Response	% Hospital/Health Science Library	Other Special Library Response	% Other Special Library	Institutional Library Response	% Institutional Library	Other	% Other
Main reason for NOT applying																
Lack of time	3	12.00%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of significant collection to digitize	12	48.00%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	3	50.00%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
Uncertain if qualified	3	12.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of project	2	8.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	5	20.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Importance of potential workshop/training topic																
Cooperative Collection Development																
1 - Very Unimportant	4	12.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
2	3	9.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	5	16.13%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	10	32.26%	3	37.50%	1	25.00%	2	66.67%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
5 - Very Important	9	29.03%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
Mean =	3.55															
Median =	4.00															
Internet searching skills																
1 - Very Unimportant	6	19.35%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	3	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	3	9.68%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	4	12.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
4	13	41.94%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	66.67%	4	66.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	5	16.13%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
Mean =	3.26															
Median =	4.00															
Creating web pages																
1 - Very Unimportant	4	13.33%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	6	20.00%	1	12.50%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
3	3	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
4	10	33.33%	3	37.50%	2	50.00%	1	33.33%	2	33.33%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
5 - Very Important	7	23.33%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	2	33.33%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.33															
Median =	4.00															

Montana Academic/Special/Institutional Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	4 Yr. Public University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Public University or College	4 Yr. Private University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Private University or College	2 Yr. Community or Technical College Response	% 2 Yr. Community or Technical College	Hospital/ Health Science Library Response	% Hospital/Health Science Library	Other Special Library Response	% Other Special Library	Institutional Library Response	% Institutional Library	Other	% Other
Information Literacy/Bibliographic Instruction																
1 - Very Unimportant	3	9.68%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	2	6.45%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	5	16.13%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	33.33%	3	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	13	41.94%	3	37.50%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	3	50.00%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
5 - Very Important	8	25.81%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
Mean =	3.68															
Median =	4.00															
Use of OCLC system(s)																
1 - Very Unimportant	3	9.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	3.23%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	5	16.13%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
4	12	38.71%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	2	66.67%	2	33.33%	3	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
5 - Very Important	10	32.26%	5	62.50%	1	25.00%	1	33.33%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
Mean =	3.81															
Median =	4.00															
Use of MLN database project resources																
1 - Very Unimportant	2	6.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
2	1	3.23%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	8	25.81%	3	37.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
4	13	41.94%	2	25.00%	3	75.00%	3	100.00%	4	66.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	7	22.58%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
Mean =	3.71															
Median =	4.00															
Other																
1 - Very Unimportant	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%
5 - Very Important	4	80.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%
Mean =	4.80															
Median =	5.00															

Montana Academic/Special/Institutional Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	4 Yr. Public University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Public University or College	4 Yr. Private University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Private University or College	2 Yr. Community or Technical College Response	% 2 Yr. Community or Technical College	Hospital/ Health Science Library Response	% Hospital/Health Science Library	Other Special Library Response	% Other Special Library	Institutional Library Response	% Institutional Library	Other	% Other
Most significant thing MSL could do or provide to be helpful																
Technology technical assistance	5	16.13%	2	25.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Library management consulting	3	9.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
Workshops/continuing education opportunities	20	64.52%	6	75.00%	3	75.00%	2	66.67%	4	66.67%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	2	66.67%
Other	3	9.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Most important role for MSL																
Legislative advocacy	1	3.23%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Include all types of libraries in resource sharing	6	19.35%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
Providing better visibility for libraries	3	9.68%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	33.33%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Continuing education/staff development	2	6.45%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Database licensing	4	12.90%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Setting a vision for Montana libraries	13	41.94%	3	37.50%	2	50.00%	1	33.33%	1	16.67%	4	66.67%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
Other	2	6.45%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Job title																
Director	19	61.29%	3	37.50%	2	50.00%	2	66.67%	4	66.67%	4	66.67%	1	100.00%	3	100.00%
Reference Librarian	5	16.13%	3	37.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Cataloger/Bibliographer	1	3.23%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Acquisitions Librarian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Bibliographic Instruction Librarian	1	3.23%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Support staff	1	3.23%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	4	12.90%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Acceptable travel time to training																
less than 30 minutes	2	6.45%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
30 - 60 minutes	2	6.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1 hour - 1 1/2 hours	4	12.90%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1 1/2 hours to 2 hours	12	38.71%	4	50.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	3	50.00%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
Over 2 hours	11	35.48%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	3	100.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
Type of library																
4 Yr. publicly funded college or university	8	25.81%														
4 Yr. privately funded college or university	4	12.90%														
2 Yr. Community or Technical College	3	9.68%														
Hospital/Health Science Library	6	19.35%														
Other "special" library	6	19.35%														
Institutional library	1	3.23%														
Other	3	9.68%														

Montana Academic/Special/Institutional Library Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	4 Yr. Public University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Public University or College	4 Yr. Private University or College Response	% 4 Yr. Private University or College	2 Yr. Community or Technical College Response	% 2 Yr. Community or Technical College	Hospital/ Health Science Library Response	% Hospital/Health Science Library	Other Special Library Response	% Other Special Library	Institutional Library Response	% Institutional Library	Other	% Other
Number of paid staff																
Less than 1.00 FTE	4	12.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1.00 FTE	2	6.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
1.01 - 2.00 FTE	7	22.58%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	2	33.33%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
2.01 - 3.00 FTE	6	19.35%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	2	66.67%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
3.01 - 5.00 FTE	1	3.23%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5.01 - 10.00 FTE	6	19.35%	2	25.00%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
10.01 - 20.00 FTE	1	3.23%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Over 20 FTE	4	12.90%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Materials and online resources budget																
Under \$ 1,000	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 1,001 - \$ 5,000	3	10.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000	4	13.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	33.33%
\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000	4	13.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%
\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000	4	13.33%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	2	66.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000	1	3.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 50,001 - \$ 75,000	1	3.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
\$ 75,001 - \$ 100,000	2	6.67%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Over \$ 100,000	11	36.67%	7	87.50%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Montana School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	\$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	Over \$50,000 Materials Budget	% Over \$50,000 Materials Budget
Participate in a federation?														
Yes	30	45.45%	14	48.28%	9	40.91%	3	33.33%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
No	36	54.55%	15	51.72%	13	59.09%	6	66.67%	1	25.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Which federation?														
Broad Valleys	7	24.14%	4	30.77%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Golden Plains	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Pathfinder	4	13.79%	2	15.38%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Sagebrush	2	6.90%	0	0.00%	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
South Central	4	13.79%	2	15.38%	1	11.11%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Tamarack	12	41.38%	5	38.46%	5	55.56%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Contact with which departments/programs?														
Library and Information Services	21	31.82%	9	31.03%	7	31.82%	3	33.33%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Library Development	4	6.06%	1	3.45%	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Montana Library Network	48	72.73%	20	68.97%	17	77.27%	7	77.78%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Talking Books Library	10	15.15%	5	17.24%	2	9.09%	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Natural Resources Information System	15	22.73%	4	13.79%	4	18.18%	4	44.44%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
None of the Above	9	13.64%	5	17.24%	3	13.64%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Subscribe to database program?														
Yes	46	69.70%	20	68.97%	16	72.73%	5	55.56%	3	75.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
No	20	30.30%	9	31.03%	6	27.27%	4	44.44%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Reason for NOT subscribing														
Lack of funds	6	30.00%	5	55.56%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	3	15.00%	2	22.22%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of Internet access	1	5.00%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of project	7	35.00%	0	0.00%	4	66.67%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	3	15.00%	1	11.11%	1	16.67%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate subscribing in next 1 - 3 years?														
Yes	4	20.00%	1	11.11%	1	16.67%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No	16	80.00%	8	88.89%	5	83.33%	2	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Participate in shared catalog program?														
Yes	11	16.67%	3	10.34%	6	27.27%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
No	55	83.33%	26	89.66%	16	72.73%	8	88.89%	4	100.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%

Montana School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	\$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget
Reason for NOT participating														
Lack of funds	20	36.36%	11	42.31%	5	31.25%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Lack of time	5	9.09%	1	3.85%	3	18.75%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Bibliographic records not machine-readable	4	7.27%	3	11.54%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Unaware of the project	7	12.73%	4	15.38%	2	12.50%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	19	34.55%	7	26.92%	6	37.50%	4	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Anticipate participating in next 1 - 3 years?														
Yes	18	32.73%	8	30.77%	5	31.25%	3	37.50%	1	25.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
No	37	67.27%	18	69.23%	11	68.75%	5	62.50%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Most useful continuing education provider														
Local school district	10	19.23%	7	29.17%	2	12.50%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Multitype library federation	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Montana Library Association	31	59.62%	15	62.50%	8	50.00%	6	75.00%	2	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Montana State Library	9	17.31%	1	4.17%	5	31.25%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Other	2	3.85%	1	4.17%	1	6.25%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Importance of potential workshop/training topics														
Collection Development														
1 - Very Unimportant	2	3.03%	2	6.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	7	10.61%	3	10.34%	1	4.55%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
3	20	30.30%	11	37.93%	5	22.73%	4	44.44%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	15	22.73%	4	13.79%	6	27.27%	2	22.22%	2	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	22	33.33%	9	31.03%	10	45.45%	2	22.22%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.73													
Median =	4.00													
Internet searching skills														
1 - Very Unimportant	3	4.55%	1	3.45%	1	4.55%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
2	4	6.06%	3	10.34%	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	8	12.12%	4	13.79%	2	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
4	20	30.30%	7	24.14%	9	40.91%	2	22.22%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	31	46.97%	14	48.28%	10	45.45%	6	66.67%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	4.09													
Median =	4.00													

Montana School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

		All Responses	% of all responses	\$ 0 - \$5,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget
Creating web pages															
1 - Very Unimportant		2	3.03%	2	6.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2		13	19.70%	3	10.34%	7	31.82%	3	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3		25	37.88%	13	44.83%	7	31.82%	3	33.33%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4		15	22.73%	6	20.69%	3	13.64%	2	22.22%	2	50.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
5 - Very Important		11	16.67%	5	17.24%	5	22.73%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Mean =	3.30													
	Median =	3.00													
Integrating technology/information literacy into curriculum															
1 - Very Unimportant		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2		4	6.06%	2	6.90%	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
3		1	1.52%	1	3.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4		14	21.21%	5	17.24%	7	31.82%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important		47	71.21%	21	72.41%	15	68.18%	7	77.78%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
	Mean =	4.58													
	Median =	5.00													
Teaching library/information literacy skills															
1 - Very Unimportant		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3		4	6.06%	3	10.34%	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4		16	24.24%	5	17.24%	8	36.36%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important		46	69.70%	21	72.41%	14	63.64%	7	77.78%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
	Mean =	4.64													
	Median =	5.00													
Use of MLN database project resources															
1 - Very Unimportant		2	3.03%	1	3.45%	1	4.55%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2		4	6.06%	1	3.45%	3	13.64%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3		13	19.70%	6	20.69%	4	18.18%	2	22.22%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4		19	28.79%	10	34.48%	4	18.18%	2	22.22%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important		28	42.42%	11	37.93%	10	45.45%	5	55.56%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
	Mean =	4.02													
	Median =	4.00													

Montana School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	\$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget
Other														
1 - Very Unimportant	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 - Very Important	4	80.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Mean =	4.80													
Median =	5.00													
Most helpful thing MSL could do														
Technology technical assistance	11	16.67%	8	27.59%	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Library management consulting	5	7.58%	2	6.90%	2	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Workshops/continuing education opportunities	46	69.70%	18	62.07%	19	86.36%	7	77.78%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	4	6.06%	1	3.45%	1	4.55%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Most important role for MSL														
Legislative advocacy	10	15.38%	5	17.86%	2	9.09%	2	22.22%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Including schools in planning for resource sharing	13	20.00%	6	21.43%	4	18.18%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Providing better visibility for school library/media centers	9	13.85%	6	21.43%	2	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Providing Continuing education/staff development	6	9.23%	2	7.14%	3	13.64%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Providing group database licensing	27	41.54%	9	32.14%	11	50.00%	5	55.56%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Job title														
District library/media coordinator	4	6.06%	1	3.45%	2	9.09%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Library/media center director	47	71.21%	26	89.66%	12	54.55%	5	55.56%	3	75.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
Library/media center staff	9	13.64%	1	3.45%	4	18.18%	3	33.33%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	6	9.09%	1	3.45%	4	18.18%	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Montana School Library/Media Center Survey Summary

	All Responses	% of all responses	\$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 0 - \$ 5,000 Materials Budget	\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000 Materials Budget	\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000 Materials Budget	\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000 Materials Budget	\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% \$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget	% Over \$ 50,000 Materials Budget
Acceptable travel time to training														
less than 30 minutes	2	3.28%	1	3.85%	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
30 - 60 minutes	10	16.39%	3	11.54%	4	19.05%	3	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1 hour - 1 1/2 hours	18	29.51%	12	46.15%	6	28.57%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1 1/2 hours to 2 hours	20	32.79%	5	19.23%	7	33.33%	4	44.44%	2	66.67%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Over 2 hours	11	18.03%	5	19.23%	3	14.29%	2	22.22%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Number of paid staff														
Less than 1.00 FTE	10	15.38%	6	21.43%	2	9.09%	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1.00 FTE	28	43.08%	15	53.57%	11	50.00%	1	11.11%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
1.01 - 2.00 FTE	16	24.62%	7	25.00%	6	27.27%	3	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2.01 - 3.00 FTE	4	6.15%	0	0.00%	2	9.09%	2	22.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3.01 - 5.00 FTE	5	7.69%	0	0.00%	1	4.55%	1	11.11%	2	50.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
5.01 - 10.00 FTE	1	1.54%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Over 10 FTE	1	1.54%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
Materials and online resources budget														
Under \$ 1,000	0	0.00%												
\$ 1,001 - \$ 5,000	29	43.94%												
\$ 5,001 - \$ 10,000	22	33.33%												
\$ 10,001 - \$ 20,000	9	13.64%												
\$ 20,001 - \$ 35,000	4	6.06%												
\$ 35,001 - \$ 50,000	1	1.52%												
Over \$ 50,000	1	1.52%												

APPENDIX D

LDD Staff Focus Group and Interviews

The web site of the Library Development Department (LDD) of the Montana State Library gives the following description of the LDD. “LDD staff provides consulting services to all libraries in Montana and assists with the improvement of library services statewide. Information and assistance are provided in technology, state certification program, library improvement projects, collection management, federal grant and assistance programs, legal issues, library statistics, federation activities, and statewide licensing and purchasing of electronic resources. LDD also provides training and continuing education opportunities of all kinds for library staff across the state.”

Focus Group Discussion

Four staff members took part in the discussion, including one consultant who participated via telephone. Their tenure with the MSL ranged from two to fourteen years.

What program or activity carried out with LSTA funds has had the greatest impact since 1997?

We facilitated providing Internet connectivity—connecting rural libraries to the world.

Building the infrastructure would have taken another ten years without LSTA funds.

Having the State Library doing it also made it important; some of the small libraries needed extra attention to raise their awareness of technology and the Internet (and their need for it).

The technology consultants hear they’re the best thing the state library has done. The small rural libraries are so grateful for our help. They’re glad to have a contact, someone to work through their problems with them.

We’ve been able to provide more continuing education and workshops. That has improved how many of the librarians like their jobs. They have more confidence in themselves now.

We also contribute to MLA’s Wired Montana listserv. That has helped us organize a lot—share info and resources, spread word on continuing education events. It means we have a common base for communications. It’s good for keeping people aware of what’s going on politically too.

Staff here negotiated statewide contracts too for OCLC and InfoTrac. (That actually started before MLN, with Lasercat and WLN.)

Are these things that would have happened without LSTA, but perhaps not as soon?

The consulting work of the technology consultants wouldn't have happened because individual communities wouldn't have had the funds or known what they needed. Some communities would have, but it wouldn't have happened for many. The trust zone for consultants wouldn't have happened. We do a lot of hand holding, they trust us in a variety of things. With the Gates computers, for example, we had to tell them that it would be all right. We're a support base for them and it wasn't inevitable.

The idea for having technology consultants was generated from the field.

We provide easier access to continuing education, but they could have gotten that elsewhere; Internet connectivity would have happened eventually.

Continuing education would have been a lot more limited without LSTA funds. Librarians would have had to rely on MLA, etc. LSTA funds support workshops and the institute

The consortia elements would have happened, but the technology consultants have helped with federations and their work. Federation structure has also caused some things to happen. The State Library supports that in helping people stay on target. Groups probably would have figured out themselves, but the MSL has helped them work.

LISD is a participant in the shared database and is coordinating other state agencies in shared database. If MSL hadn't been involved, would automation have happened?

It would have happened without us. The state universities have OMNI online catalog. Bozeman, the tribal colleges and some community colleges have combined in a shared catalog.

Participants in Missoula and Bitterroot were talking already. The shared catalogs were in the progress; it's just that MSL has supported the communication for things to happen. State library has leveled the playing field with a welcome mat. People are thinking bigger than just locally (MLN gets credit for that).

We'll be asking focus group participants about two LDD goals 1) all Montana citizens have direct access to information through telecommunications at their libraries, and goal 3) Montana citizens are served by librarians and trustees who are knowledgeable about all aspects of library service. What comments do you think the librarians and trustees will have about progress on those goals?

Librarians are surprised how heavily Internet is used in their libraries. Now they're saying they need more and faster computers.

I get questions, how can we count these hits? They're looking for justification for getting bigger and better in the future. They didn't think it would happen.
Small libraries have access to things much more easily and quickly via Internet (government information for example)

In some small rural libraries, because of low funding, there's been little change.

They have dial up access, but it's very limited. For the people in the community who have chosen to use the Internet, it has big impact, but others haven't used it yet. It's hard to figure out how the library can help.

Many librarians aren't terribly secure about what they can find on the Internet. We're moving in the direction, but we aren't there yet.

They do think it has improved, but filtering and censorship are problems. We heard lots of conversations at the library conference—lots of new issues for them

We've done a lot of workshops on how to use OCLC and Infotrac tools in some of the federations. Those who embraced those classes have been able to start providing new services (we're handling much at their level). They're starting to provide more reference at their own communities. Biggest problem is that they haven't found funds to increase staff to handle the new demands. Computers in libraries have stretched staffing resources. Helping patrons with computers in all sizes of libraries has created all sorts of new challenges. There's tremendous variety in what patrons can do too, and not enough staff to provide computer support for the variety of skills patrons have. Some librarians have to clean the toilet before they go home too! It's a shame but it's true.
Some change has happened because of changes in personnel. Some staff left; new staff embraced technology.

Lots of older library people have been more technology resistant.

Goal 2— knowledgeable librarians and trustees?

When our department was formed, we decided to set out a more formal structure of events. We set up four events; now have just the fall workshop and summer institute. (Others have fallen away.) Also having the technology consultants available is ongoing continuing education.

With the older trustee manual, the staff did lots of dog and pony shows. Now with the new handbook, we're hoping it'll be easier to use. We're not sure how much training they'll want.

We're offered things for trustees. (We did a dog and pony show eight years ago, did get trustees to attend)

In last three years we haven't really tackled trustees. Federation meetings have done better. A few come to MLA.

The last Tamarack Federation meeting was OCLC type training and that wasn't suitable for trustees. So Bob took excerpts from forthcoming trustee manual and offered a session for trustees. They need a different level of information on lots of stuff. The session was very well received. It went two and a half hours when he thought it would be an hour. He particularly likes talking trustee to trustee, without having directors present. The sessions was happening under our guidance and we could correct misinformation.

Trustees need their own continuing education, either locally or at least regionally. It's hard enough to get them to federation meetings.

MLA used to have separate public and trustee divisions—somehow the trustees have floated away.

A lot of trustee education is one board at a time. It would be good if each board saw someone from the state library each year. Unfortunately, it's the good ones (trustees) who go away to training (They're not the ones that most need the training!). We need to develop a dynamic at the local level. It's helpful too to watch the director and trustee dynamic. If you can see what's going on you can work with them over time to help them with communication, their roles, etc. They need help in figuring out which job is theirs and which belongs to the other. (directors and trustees)

Talk a bit about the learning that takes place informally from tech consultants?

There are really two categories. One is getting acquainted and a cram session on what they need immediately, like OCLC Cat express. The second is brush up, going over something again. And answering questions they were afraid to ask in group sessions. Or talking people through something over phone; providing security and hand holding with something new. Sometimes this is even for continuing education credit if we fill out the forms. The other nice thing is that when I'm there doing a session, I'll do a session for whoever else is on the staff or in the area (schools, etc).

How have their needs changed?

It's a mark of sophistication on the part of their users. People have already tried to answer the questions on their own on the Internet; then they come to library for help.

What about the relationship with MLA? How do the programs fit together?

We don't compete, have a good relationship.

Karen sits on the MLA board; there's a lot of communication about conference planning.

We try not to duplicate their programs. It's a collaborative arrangement.

Diane is on the professional development committee of MLA. She hears public librarians would rather come to our summer institute than MLA. We don't hear negative things except that there are too many—people can't afford to go to all, have trouble deciding. Diane works with office of public instruction to get school librarians certificates for MLA attendance.

Worst thing is some do have to decide which continuing education program to attend.

The Institute comes shortly after the MLA conference.

How do you think people in focus groups will feel about the LDD goals? What criticisms will they have?

Not everyone likes to see all the LSTA money go to statewide projects. Some want grants for individual libraries.

People like the State Library leadership in setting standards and support levels with consultants. People want the benefits of statewide programs (MLN) and they also want money to play with. That does cause some problems. Some of the projects we used to do were some neat local things, but they weren't of the same magnitude.

Some libraries are looking for different grants outside state library.

Since federations have gone multi-type, you'll hear we don't do enough for schools. OPI doesn't have a school media resource person so they'd like us to do more.

You might hear some of our support is sporadic. Consultants were spread pretty thin for awhile—focusing on someone else means some of our follow through isn't as good as we'd like. Statewide stuff sometimes pulls us away.

It's really hard to draw the lines on technology support. It's very easy to become their technology support person. Advice versus support is a hard line to define sometimes. Things are subject to breakdown.

They'll say the State Library just doesn't get it in regards to local library budgets. (In some areas populations have decreased—librarians are unsure they'll be able to keep the lights on. They feel things State Library does are planned for the west, not the east.)

How will people in the focus groups rank priorities among the goals?

Goal 2 (Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format) That would Rank very highly

Goal 6 (All Montana citizens have access to library services.) This is the most important one. This is significant in rural areas.

A #8 goal would be help libraries get more money. We put together packages, but they're expensive. Librarians in rural areas see conflicting messages in this.

What grades would you give on progress being made on the goals?

Goal 1 *All Montana citizens have direct access to information through telecommunications at their libraries.*

A, B, B+, A We're not there yet (haven't found a way to get people to have their own computer) (Average=B+)

Goal 2 *Montana citizens will have timely access to information despite its location or format.*

B, C, B, B We're doing an average job. There are lots of format problems, lots of time is needed to address this. (Average= B-)

Goal 3 *Montana citizens are served by librarians and trustees who are knowledgeable about all aspects of library service.*

For librarians a B, trustees a C; a B; an A for librarians but a C for trustees; B for librarians and C trustees We get good marks for being responsive. (Average=librarians B; trustees C)

Goal 4 *Montana citizens know about and value the range of services provided by libraries.*

I'd give it a D. We spend lots of time in field. We've come up from an F, but have long way to go. The Montana public is a tough nut to crack. We will gain ground, but citizens have wonderment! Libraries haven't done well in this area either. It's a C. We're doing some stuff with statewide databases, press releases, but a lot of responsibility on this has to come from libraries promoting themselves. A C, I agree, we need to do better job. I haven't done much of this for years. The overall state picture is a C. We do rely on libraries to promote themselves. It hasn't been our priority. (Average=C)

Goal 5 *MSL, with federations and local library agencies, will provide leadership to assure that Montana citizens receive excellent library services.*

I'd give that a B. Federations are making good strides in providing leadership;

I'd say a B also. In the multi-type federations libraries are helping each other—not perfect or excellent; an A, we're doing well in providing leadership. B (Average=B)

Goal 6 *All Montana citizens have access to library services.*

B—in some areas a D in near future, but we can't do much about it in some areas; we're working on remote access to databases; B. B. B (Average=B)

Goal 7 *Montana's students are served by school libraries that meet state standards.*

An F--this has been our discarded element. Now that we've made federations multi-type we're working with schools, but school libraries are soooo very far behind. An F, but we are doing a cooperative technology survey; an F-- we're just not doing this. We're just spread really thin. "NA" didn't remember this was even here! "We don't have legal responsibility for school libraries." New superintendent is a school librarian so there may be hope. (Average=F)

Are there future directions or missing goals you'd add?

Maybe some activities are missing, i.e., goal 4—we should be doing pr workshops so they know how to do public relations.

We do things in our comfortable zones. But it seems like the State Library ought to be forming consortium with others—newspapers, radio associations, etc. If we organized that type of partnership/relationship, we could promote libraries on a statewide level. ALA has something like this.

Another goal might be encouraging local cooperation on some things. Schools, libraries, county offices could save money if they shared Internet, but there seem to be these local rivalries so I'm not sure how much could happen.

There's such a variety of technology providers that people at the local level are totally dismayed. They can't tell who's providing what or what the fee structure is. At the state level we should get some of these reps at the table trying to figure out what libraries can have access too. It's going to become even more complex and local libraries will be at total mercy of these providers. Telecommunications in the state seem to be a real mess. Some little phone companies know nothing beyond telephones. The market here is too small to interest the really big/good companies. And, those remaining aren't encouraged to cooperate. I don't know what we can do, but if we don't facilitate something, libraries are going to get disconnected.

There's a training glut; there's a real need for the State Library to become a clearinghouse. We could promote a two year training calendar; the State Library

wouldn't need to be in charge, but help MLA and federations, and larger local libraries coordinate and organize into beginning, intermediate, advanced training so that training is more effective overall. Seeing what was coming would help libraries budget so they get the training they need. It's kind of collective shot-gun training at present. There's too much on Wired Montana already. Libraries need help in trying to figure out how all this fits together.

APPENDIX E

Talking Book Library

Users Focus Groups and Interviews

Two focus group sessions were held with Talking Book Library (TBL) users: one in Billings, the other in Helena. A total of twenty people participated. Eight additional TBL users who were unable to attend the focus group sessions were interviewed via telephone.

Focus Group Discussions

Focus group participants were asked where they first learned about the Library of Congress talking book program or the Montana TBL. A number of participants indicated that they started using services in another state; however all of these individuals said that they had no difficulty making the connection with the Montana program when they moved to Montana. Focus group participants indicated that they had learned about the TBL from physicians, people at the School for the Blind, friends, the Veterans' Administration, the Montana Association of the Blind, the Great Falls Association of the Blind, Montana State Blind and Low-Vision Services, Lions Clubs, Pioneers, and from a friend at the local public library.

Most focus group participants thought the medical profession could do a better job of informing people about talking books. They thought doctors should especially stress the fact that you don't have to be totally blind to use the TBL service. Focus group attendees also said that friends and acquaintances who see the machines are curious and interested in what the machines do. This was seen as an opportunity to share information about the program.

Those attending focus groups felt that the service needs to be promoted more in senior news bulletins and on the World Wide Web through sites offering information related to individuals with disabilities. They felt that this was especially important in Montana since it is so large geographically and sparsely populated. However, they pointed out that promotions done in written form (on paper) aren't much use to the visually impaired. Web-based information was seen as useful to sighted individuals who work with the visually impaired and to individuals with physical and visual impairments who have adaptive devices that help them use computers.

The focus group participants offered several reasons why some folks don't use the talking book service. Some were relating their own experiences prior to becoming users of the service. They said that some people who are eligible choose not to use the service because they don't accept that they have a visual limitation. Others think that because it's free, it's charity, and they don't want that. They expressed the opinion that there need to be people willing to talk about the fact that losing your vision doesn't mean the end of the world!

What users like most about the service overall is the quality of the narrators/readers (those whose voices are easiest to understand), the superb staff in Helena, and the remote access to talking book catalogs on the web. They like that TBL encourages reading and the enjoyment of books and that there are “home grown” books (books of Montana authors) in addition to those recorded by the National Library Service (NLS). They’re also pleased that mailing is free and that someone takes care of servicing the playing machines and of keeping them in good working order. It’s also satisfying that the various agencies involved in serving people with vision disabilities seem to be talking to each other. Several users noted that they appreciate that the talking books are not abridged.

Most of the dislikes or complaints shared regarding talking book services were directly connected to the larger national program. Users wish the equipment were smaller, that there were more materials recorded, especially more serious works (or a different genre than seems to be recorded, such as more westerns than romances).

Some participants wished that the talking book format would move to CDs rather than tape cassettes that are currently in use. (NLS is in the process of evaluating various digital formats for the next generation of talking books.) One person noted that there are really two separate populations being served, one of younger, computer literate people who want to access books and information electronically, and one of older people who may be put off by the new technologies and are comfortable with the technologies as they are.

Participants in the focus groups talked about other services that are offered through the Talking Book Library as well as about potential service improvements or enhancements. Several people mentioned the availability of descriptive videos, especially of older movies and expressed their appreciation for this service. Most who had tried the descriptive videos indicated a desire for additional titles.

Some participants wondered if commercial books on tape that are available from rental sources such as the Cracker Barrel Restaurant chain could be supplied through the Talking Book Library. Other mentioned improved access to large print books that some people can use and can get from some public libraries. One person wondered if there was an international interlibrary loan service that would get recorded materials for them from other countries. Participants in both sessions wanted current “great stuff” to be recorded more quickly. Some had used talking book services in other states or were knowledgeable about newer adaptive technology devices and shared those experiences with their group.

Focus group attendees were asked about their use of other library resources such as those provided by local public libraries. Only a few participants indicated that they use other library services such as interlibrary loan, university libraries, large print materials from their public library, Braille materials from Salt Lake City, and materials from Recordings for the Blind and Dyslexic. However, it should be noted that those who do use other services use a wide variety of services.

Focus group attendees were asked if they had any complaints about talking book service. There were some complaints about tapes that continue to be circulated from Helena that are seem to be defective or worn. Some people said that they thought the quality of the tape used for recording had declined. Others attributed muffled sound quality and tape jamming to equipment that they felt was sub-standard. A few people spoke about a particular series of machines that had been recalled and replaced and expressed the opinion that replacement machines were not as good as the earlier model. Some users complained that they get too many books through the automatic selection process and have been unable to communicate to the TBL to reduce the number they get.

Other suggestions made by focus group participants included providing more web-based information by scanning documents, such as newsletters, so that they could be accessed electronically, and finding readers for more college texts. There were several requests for additional titles to be recorded.

Montana users think the program works well and that the system for selecting and recording Montana books is well developed and effective. One participants said, “The biggest comment I have is ‘muchas gracias!’”

Interviews

Eight TBL users were interviewed via telephone. While many of their comments echoed those made by focus group participants, there were also a few new perspectives and ideas. Like the focus group participants, some of the interviewees had been referred to the Montana TBL from talking book libraries in other states; another had used the service in another state and appears not to have been referred specifically, but said she had no trouble in finding the Montana program when she arrived.

Of the eight persons interviewed, one was an avid computer user and had JAWS software. He said ordering books via the web was a good idea, but that he’d miss talking to the people at TBL, even though they occasionally transpose numbers and send him the wrong books.

Several mentioned having used descriptive videos. One said her only complaint about the videos was that she could get only one at a time, but another said the videos weren’t really suitable because he had a hearing loss too. Yet another had trouble “following the videos.” Several thought the machines weren’t being repaired as well as they used to be; another thought perhaps NLS was using cheaper (and lower quality) tapes than before. As with the focus group participants, those interviewed enjoyed the Montana books that are recorded by volunteers and wanted to be able to get good popular books faster. Suggestions for subject areas that needed more recordings included scripts of popular movies, lyrics, musicals, books on music, literary criticism, and philosophy.

APPENDIX F

Talking Book Library

Staff Focus Groups and Interviews Summary

Five staff members and volunteers took part in a focus group; interviews were conducted with three additional staff members.

Executive Summary:

The people who worked in TBL think the service is important and that the users receive good service. There was agreement, however, that the service lacks sufficient outreach and promotion. "People don't know about the service, nor that it's free to eligible users." Staff suggested that most of the complaints that they receive are about things that are outside their control: the content of the recorded materials--too much or too little sex or too much violence and murder; or problems in mail delivery.

Some felt that the Web OPAC (online catalog) is likely to have an impact, probably increasing the number of users of the service, particularly younger, computer literate people. It was suggested that this also might be a way for public library staffs to be more involved in providing service to potential TBL users. However, only one percent of the users responding to a recent TBL survey have a computer they could use it to access the TBL collections to select titles. Computers are also having an impact within the TBL in that much of the work of the agency is done by volunteers and these are often older people who have not used computers extensively and would not choose to volunteer for tasks requiring computer use.

The lack of space is a problem for TBL staff and volunteers; being crowded means the collections have to be weeded often and staff who use telephones (the reader's advisors) have difficulty in making themselves understood over the noise. An improved telephone system, one with voice mail, was suggested as a way of helping staff overcome this problem.

Overall the TBL suffers from lack of financial resources. The high number of volunteers working in the TBL is both a blessing and a problem. The agency could not perform the amount of work it does without the volunteers, but the high number of volunteers is also perceived by the legislature as an efficient way to save money.

Future directions include digitization and, perhaps, expanding into descriptive videos. TBL is waiting for the National Library Service (NLS) to determine its future directions before TBL moves toward other formats. Regardless of the next formats, any planning process undertaken by TBL will need to be inclusive.

Staff Focus Group

How do people find out about TBL?

MT Association for the Blind; social workers who help sign people up, a couple of hospitals, School for the Blind in Great Falls. Christie speaks to groups. People in the community using the service tell others. Word of mouth. We try to work with schools; reading disability students.

We lack outreach; PR. People don't know about the service. Two in this group learned about it from volunteers—people they knew who happened to be volunteers here. There was an announcement on PBS program for senior citizens. Fact that it's free is unknown to most.

Computer system has recently been refined, so we could handle a lot more patrons. Just went online with Web OPAC—people can order books on line. That should appeal to a whole new population base, those who have computers.

What will we hear from users that they dislike about service?

Most complaints come about too much or too little sex or murder (like westerns, but no violence; like romances, but no sex). We're getting better at adjusting people's profiles to send them just what they want.

Maybe you'll hear about glitches in the system—woman who got 20 books at once, for example.

We have mail issues too—stuff comes back the next day after we've mailed it. The main complaint is not enough books or that they come too late—they're problems in mail delivery. Sometimes people get things a week or two later. There are problems with mail delivery in Helena, Butte, and Missoula. Delivery is good in Great Falls. We've had DVDs stolen—three through Butte. In one other instance a case came back empty, but we were able to trace it to a new postal carrier. It came back a month later. So—we changed the labeling on the boxes so it doesn't say video any more. Outside labeling is in braille! Some people like to use these videos with narration because they can "watch" a movie with their families.

What other library services do they use?

Most don't realize they can ILL large print from other libraries. Some have used public library audio books (We know because they're returned to us.) The public library could become a great resource if we could train staff there. They could get to the website OPAC and look for/order things for TBL users (and others). You do have to have a patron ID to borrow from it.

TBL has 50,000 titles of unabridged books, usually 4 or 5 copies of each, and about 600 Montana books.

We tried deposit collections in public libraries years ago, but lost lots of books and machines, especially machines, so we stopped doing it.

Do you make selections for people or is the selection mostly automatic?

It varies... patron records are coded:

TA = computer selects based on general areas-romances, etc.

TL = they tell you specifically which books or authors they want.

We try to put most patrons on TA at first because some older patrons have trouble getting everything set up. We start them with three books. Then you do a follow up after a month or two to check on them. Some patrons have health issues—they forget that they've called already today. In-state users can use an 800 #; snowbirds (AZ, TX) would like an out-of-state 800#. We continue to send things to snowbirds while they're gone. Transferring to another state is pretty easy, but if they're coming back we don't transfer them.

We have 2,600-3,000 users; maybe one percent of them have a computer.

Twenty-two have signed up to use the Web OPAC; seven have actually used it to order books. Another eight email their book orders to us.

We think use of the web OPAC will pick up more in the fall after school starts.

We anticipate that this type of use will grow over time.

What progress has been made in reaching the TBL goals?

There are lots of financial problems at the moment. We can still provide things, but it takes longer. Goal 3 (*There will be sufficient funding and staff to offer the best possible patron service.*) should be first priority. We have hang-ups with the duplicator and can't buy new tapes (so that hinders service).

Space is a big problem. Lack of space makes us crowded and noisy; it's hard to talk on the phones.

We could get a better phone system with volume control, voice mail. Have only one voice mail—it's on the 800 line. It would be helpful if we each had voice mail. Patrons like to speak to their own reader's advisor.

We need another staff person to answer phones. Right now there's a Green Thumb person doing it for 20 hrs/week. Having that person here is great, because you can get so much more done (without the telephone interruptions).

I think we need another reader's advisor.

Volunteer said: "Reader's advisors talk wonderfully; they so patient with people."

Staff person: "volunteers do all the work."

The problem is that legislature looks at the number of volunteers and says "that's good; you're doing fine; you don't need anything more."

We have about seventy volunteers, which is about 6 FTEs, including the telephone pioneers.

Back to the three goals... are any inappropriate? How would you grade the progress that's been made in achieving these goals?

All are still good, appropriate.

Goal 1 *Staff, volunteers and patrons will work in a safe, comfortable, and efficient working environment.*

We are running out of space for the talking books... for a comfortable environment I'd give it an A for everything except efficient. We don't have a staff place to get away. It's just a little room and there is no place for the volunteers. Air quality is an F... the rest might be a B. I have allergies... had to be at home for a while when they were putting in the new carpeting. I'd give it a C

Goal 2 *Montana residents will receive the best possible service from the Talking Book Library.*

A
A+
A
A

Goal 3 *There will be sufficient funding and staff to offer the best possible patron service.*

KLAS (the computerized circulation and user tracking system) needs to be upgraded
Digitization is going to be very expensive...
Everything would be completely changed
We're waiting to find out what NLS is doing
Have to wait to print catalog
Have to wait months to have the duplicator fixed
Only two people can go to the Salt Lake Conference

F, F, F

TBL staff asked the consultants to share the feedback from the user sessions. "We'd like to know if they're satisfied."

Other Comments

The recording program focuses on Montana authors and issues; they record about fifty books each year from two recording studios: one here at TBL and another at the prison in Deer Lodge. There are twenty teams: a narrator, a monitor who runs the recording equipment, and a reviewer who listens to the product. They use NLS Standards as guidelines, but haven't gone through the official quality assurance program. The goal

this year is to get two books and one magazine on the official NLS list. Tasks for volunteers used to be very hands on, but tasks have evolved toward more clerical things. The easiest volunteer jobs to fill are the manual ones: rewinding tapes, pulling and re-shelving books. The hardest are any dealing with using the computer. The major pool of volunteers is senior citizens, many of whom haven't developed computer skills. The local RSVP has been sponsoring computer courses and that has helped a lot. Overall it averages 100-120 people per year who are volunteering at TBL, NRIS, and LLD. It's difficult to imagine how the talking books program could be done without volunteer assistance. There has been a major increase in users in last three years and the program will need another full time paid person soon.

On average 600 books a day are checked out; approximately the same number are checked in each day. Quite a few come back without a tape or needing repair. Maybe 20-25 a day need repair. Weeding the collection is the least satisfying part of circulation, but it has to be done because of the space limitations here. The complaints that we get are mostly related to users not getting the number of books they want, or not getting them as fast as they'd like. The post office here in Helena is a problem sometimes. Space is a problem here...maybe compact shelving would work?

TBL provides good patron service; the staff is excellent in meeting patron needs; staff and volunteers work well together toward common goals. The database is good. Transferring to the KLAS automation system has improved service at a minimal cost and the staff has adapted well. Overall staff in the building has good relationships. The recording program is good, produces excellent quality materials.

We haven't been as successful in getting the word out in the state; there are lots of people who could use the services. The staff work environment isn't as good as we'd like; we asked legislature for one additional full time employee. (Have the equivalent of 6 full time equivalent volunteers.) Beyond that it takes a while to fill vacancies, so it's frustrating.

In terms of progress on goals, it would be a "B-" on safety. There's lots of non-TBL traffic walking through our area. A "B+" on comfortable: we've made a big effort on ergonomic changes, but the building itself seems to have heating/cooling/air quality problems.

A "B" on efficient: we could do better if we had the resources for cubicles or offices. It would be better if the staff had more privacy. The volunteers are efficient. We do a darn good job for what we have. A "B+" on service. The service is excellent! Digitization and newer services are coming. A "C+" on sufficient funding and staff: This is the only department within the library that has a trust fund, but we have no Friends organization. The Trust Fund was last used in '98 for automation. We need a full time outreach person.

We need a work plan for digitization. People doing the recordings here want to go digital, but we're taking a conservative approach, waiting to see what NLS does.

We have tried to increase the numbers of users, but haven't had any firm objectives. We could expand descriptive videos, but at this point we're serving just the NLS-eligible and descriptive videos would draw users from beyond the NLS-eligible.

We're running out of space. We're doing our last major weeding project and then we'll need to delete some of the older items. But, people want westerns, romances, etc., the older things that NLS isn't re-recording.

The next plan needs to be more progressive, inclusive than our old one.

APPENDIX G

LISD Staff Focus Groups and Interviews Summary

The April 2001 Montana State Library web page describes the Library and Information Services Department (LISD) as “the ‘library’ component of the Montana State Library...(it) serves the work-related information needs of state government employees, provides backup reference assistance to librarians throughout the state, and provides public access to state publications for Montana citizens.” Prior to 2000 the department served in a more generalized role as back up to libraries in the state and as a library for the government employees in Helena who chose to come to it.

In early 2000 the department was reorganized and its primary focus narrowed to emphasize service to state government employees as in the web page description. The consultants were asked to review the department’s five goals and to give a brief progress report on the achievement of those goals since the reorganization. The consultants spent one day conducting a staff focus group and interviewing supervisors and users. A total of ten people talked with the consultants specifically about LISD. During the focus groups held with librarians and trustees throughout the state the participants were also queried briefly on their use of LISD services.

Current Goals:

Goal 1:

An easy to use web interface provides clients with reliable access to pertinent, up-to-date resources of the state library and other agency libraries, including, books, journals, state documents, federal documents, reference databases, and specialty online journals and bibliographic databases.

Goal 2:

In 2002, state employees throughout Montana are familiar with and value the services of the Library and Information Services Department.

Goal 3:

Urgent requests receive priority attention and are handled within required timeframes.

Goal 4:

Librarians are readily available by telephone or at the Library and assist clients to define questions, use resources, and develop strategies for finding answers in unfamiliar topic areas.

Goal 5:

State employees use the department’s web-site and their email software to register, request loans, photocopies, current awareness services, literature searches, and document retrieval, and to schedule training or consulting services.

Findings:

It is too soon to tell how successful the reorganization of LISD will be; much of the progress so far seems to be related to positioning the department to serve the needs of state employees more effectively. The consultants believe that this is a necessary step in achieving the overarching goal of making the state library "the first place state employees go for information."

Many of the current goals are, understandably, process oriented. They speak more to creating the frameworks necessary to provide services than they do to the outcomes that state employees will derive from using the services. Although a considerable amount of work remains to be done, it is clear that a great deal of progress has been made in establishing these frameworks.

In the future, goals need to move away from the process orientation and toward a focus on users and the benefits that they will receive. The State Library has set forth an ambitious task and, while staff generally seem to be accepting of the new direction that LISD is taking, there is considerable concern as to whether the library has, or will receive, the resources it will need to effectively serve a large percentage of state employees. The Client Services Supervisor seems to have a clear vision of the role that LISD can play. It is a vision that sees the state library functioning much like a special library in a large corporate setting. This direction appears to be entirely appropriate.

However, the new vision is a considerable departure from the model of library service that has prevailed in the past. In fact, it is hard to characterize the activity of the state library in the past as a model at all. Rather, the library followed several models in delivering a variety of services to different service populations. The library acted as a public library for some state employees and individuals living in the immediate area; the library followed a special library model in delivering services to state employees accessing the library for work purposes; and finally, the library acted as a reference referral center for libraries in the state. Of these three roles or models, acting as a public library seems least appropriate. Both the reference referral activity and serving as a special library for state employees appear to be legitimate functions of a state library.

The Montana State Library is making notable progress in moving toward the special library model. There is less clarity as to the role the state library will play long-term in the reference referral arena. A number of LISD staff members expressed concerns related either to being overwhelmed if the special library model catches on and/or feeling that the public libraries of the state will not receive adequate back-up reference service.

Current LISD goals focus on creating the framework to serve state employees. Greater clarity is probably needed in describing the LISD's role as it relates to referred reference, and, if that role is limited, how local libraries should deal with reference queries that require resources or skills not available locally.

There are several areas that the Montana State Library may wish to address in the development of future goals for LISD. They are:

1. Clarification and further development of the relationships between LISD and other departmental libraries within Montana State Government.
2. The identification of specific target audiences within state government (the departments or categories of employees that LISD can serve most effectively). These targeted audiences should then be addressed in a marketing plan.
3. Clarification and enhancement of the LISD's role in regard to state documents. The state library's role in collecting, organizing, preserving, and disseminating state documents and their contents is closely related to LISD's services both to state employees and to the citizens of the state through their local libraries.

Focus Group Discussion:

Six staff members took part in a focus group discussion held May 3, 2001. Their tenure with LISD varied from six months to seven years. They were asked how the department and their jobs had changed since the reorganization, the ways in which LISD was more or less effective than before the reorganization, the areas in which progress had been made on the five goals, the goals that should be the top priority in the coming year, and their assessment of the challenges that remain.

Their comments:

More emphasis is being placed on client services than before and there's a real effort to promote LISD among state employees. As a part of the reorganization a second service desk that is staffed to provide reference and ILL service was created. That has added a new level of professional service to users of the department. There's a lot more emphasis on providing service electronically and communicating with state employees in that way. Almost all people got an increase in pay.

Before the reorganization the Library seemed to be stuck in a rut. The approach was "the information is here... come and get it." Several participants offered that the department had become more proactive. One person said "We had been more of a public library for state employees and for people who live in the immediate area." As an example, it was indicated that the library used to have many more books of literature and short stories (the Dewey classification 800s). Most of these books have been removed from the collection.

It was noted that the changing collection makes it nearly impossible to serve as a typical public library any more. However, while most participants felt that the shift from providing general reading materials to reference and research materials was appropriate,

several worried that the library will encounter problems keeping up with demand for information service if the new approach is really successful. One of the focus group participants said, "Reference, interlibrary loan (ILL), and current awareness services are all currently manageable, but the present load represents a drop in the bucket (compared to what we might be called upon to do)." Most agreed that if a significant percentage of state employees started to use the services, the library would be really stretched to keep up. It was also noted, however, that the State Legislature is usually unwilling to support potential demand and that the library is unlikely to get additional staff unless the actual demand materializes.

Some staff discomfort was expressed over the fact that many, if not most, of the people coming in still represent the general public (either people from the immediate neighborhood or state employees in search of general reading materials). Staff indicated that they're trying to de-emphasize these services. Focus group participants said that when people ask for popular reading titles or come in looking for general Internet services that they "try to nudge them toward using their local public library" for those purposes.

The library has experienced an increase in the use of state documents and of the resources in the foundation collection. The statistics also show an increase in the number of state employees coming in, but it was noted that "some of them are coming in for purposes not related to our mission." Some outreach efforts to advertise library services to state employees have been successful, but in some cases the state employees who come in as a result are still using the facility like a public library.

Most agreed that the stickiest issue has been restricting the use of the PACs/Internet computers. One person noted that, "It's a fine line because the public pays for the library and the computers with Internet access are there... Where do you draw the line?"

One relatively new employee expressed a concern that "everything seems to be going electronic, electronic, electronic." The staff member worried that eventually one person would be able to do it all and that staff would be cut. However, the others in the group disagreed. One said, "I do a lot of tutorials and coaching state employees in the resources we've got. The more state employees have access to, the more training we'll be doing!" Others chimed in repeating the concern expressed earlier that the problem was more likely to be too much demand.

One other staff member expressed a related concern saying, "Some people put too much emphasis on electronic resources. There is a tendency for people to think that they can get everything electronically at their desktop. Sometimes there are better print alternatives. I want them to have some reasons to step into our building." The person went on to say, "We could be too successful in convincing people that they don't have to come in."

What progress is being made on goals?

Goal 1:

An easy to use web interface provides clients with reliable access to pertinent, up-to-date resources of the state library and other agency libraries, including, books, journals, state documents, federal documents, reference databases, and specialty online journals and bibliographic databases.

Most in the group believed that real progress had been made toward achieving this goal. Participants in the focus group were asked to grade progress and all but one provided a very positive assessment.

Comments on this goal included:

LISD now has a web site. We now have about 40-50 pages with real information, not just links to other stuff. They include shipping lists, current journals page, links to their electronic equivalents, where they can be found on INFOTRAC, Ebsco Host, etc.

A lot of people didn't know that there are other departmental libraries. We've given them more visibility as well.

There are pages that emphasize state employee services... literature searches, ILL, suggestions. The rest is open to the public.

There was a flyer that went to all 13,000 state employees and a follow-up to new employees, promoting LISD services.

We're acquiring more online journals and making sure that our journal holdings are in good shape (may go on a shared system).

When we get new materials, a note goes out to people. These are things that weren't happening before.

The web pages are pointed more at state agencies, but the holdings are available to other libraries as well. On the web page are e-mail links that say who to contact.

Publications are getting requests and questions electronically. The web page directs people to the right person. It appears that state publications are being used more, but it's hard to say. The statistics weren't a big thing before but they are now... we're having some difficulty documenting our progress. (Can't really document what usage was before.)

We're working hard to clean up the catalog before we migrate and we're finding a lot of things to clean up. We'll be a part of the Western Montana Shared Catalog. We're also integrating state documents into the general collection.

Grades on progress: (A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, F = 1)
5,5,4,4,5,2 - mean = 4.17, median = 4.50

Goal 2:

In 2002, state employees throughout Montana are familiar with and value the services of the Library and Information Services Department.

Focus group participants offered evidence that efforts to inform state employees of the services offered by LISD were working; however, it was also recognized that the library is currently used by a very small percentage of state employees. The grades given by staff on this goal reflects this fact. Concern was also expressed that more definition of the role of LISD in serving public libraries was needed.

Following are some of the comments that were offered in discussing this goal:

State employees are becoming familiar with what we can do!

The technology consultants bring back stories of people in the public libraries using the information too.

Because of the outreach efforts we are getting requests from outside Helena: Fish and Wildlife and Public Health and Human Services from around the state.

There are lots of ILL requests coming from State Agencies

We get general phone calls from state employees asking where the library is located.

There really seems to be a caste system. It's state employees on top, then public libraries in the state, and then the general public. I'm concerned that the most loyal of the patron groups, the librarians around the state, have been de-emphasized and they're still loyal. We get a lot of calls from them and they continue to make use of our materials. I know we're moving away from serving them directly, but my concern is that many of those libraries are very small. We're still going to need to continue to help them.

I don't think that that's going to be the case. There has been a shift from providing backup collections to helping with reference and information services. We want them to become more independent, but they need a lot of handholding.

I'm seeing federal government employees coming in to use the document collections (both federal and state documents).

Grades on progress: (A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, F = 1)
3,3,4,2,3,2 - mean = 2.83, median = 3.00

Goal 3:

Urgent requests receive priority attention and are handled within required timeframes.

Staff members believed that LISD had in the past and continues to do an excellent job in this goal area. However, it was also apparent that the department is still experiencing some adjustment in regard to how decisions are made and how policies are developed. Nevertheless, participants graded the department highly on this goal.

Some representative comments include:

Urgent Requests have always been a priority. We try to satisfy those within the constraints of Interlibrary Loan. Only state employees can request ILL these days.

It isn't written down, but state employees are at the top of the list.

Turn around time on reference is very good.

Again, I worry about the quality of service if we're successful in changing what we're doing. Our plate is pretty full and we're doing a good job at the moment.

In January, March and April this year the number of reference transactions were all above 300. They used to be 200 per month.

If somebody comes into the building, they get priority service, even over phone calls from libraries. When it's a call from a library, I ask the person at the library if their patron is standing at the library desk and if she or he is, I try to deal with it like the person was standing at our desk.

Participants in the focus group were asked another question in regard to this goal. The question was, "Do you think the workflow is more efficient now than before the reorganization?" Responses were as follows:

That depends on the time of the year. The fiscal year ends June 30th. Between January and June it's hairy because we're trying to purchase the new materials. We're trying to improve the acquisitions process, using the electronic methods more.

The current awareness program (table of contents or TOC) has gone from having two people involved to having six people involved--that seems inefficient. Part of

the inefficiency is that the program is a work in progress - used to just photocopy everything. We had a system in place that would do it, but the waters have been muddied a bit. We wanted to offer just TOC for those available electronically, but we're getting requests that aren't available electronically. Instead of a replacement service, we've got duplicated services. It has added some labor and complexity.

The old version of current awareness service had thirty subscribers. Out of those thirty we now have only seven. There have been no complaints from the others, but we need to address the photocopying and faxing issues, etc. It's manageable at this point but it probably isn't in the future for those that aren't available electronically.

I have another problem with efficiency. It used to be that three or four people made the decisions. Now just one person makes the decisions and if the decisions aren't made you sit in limbo. Decisions that are made one day are changed the next. This isn't a function of the reorganization. It seems like a lot of stuff gets studied into the ground... we reach consensus and nothing ever happens or happens months later.

The Internet Use policy is a case in point. We had a meeting several months ago, but we never had follow-up meetings; we never got a formal Internet Use Policy. So without the policy, what do you do when the public comes to play hearts on the computer?

There are things that have been discussed since I got here that haven't been resolved.

In the reorganization one person took on too much and they're not very good at following through. You don't have the authority to make the decision so you end up feeling inefficient.

Grades on progress: (A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, F = 1)
5,5,5,4,5,5 - mean = 4.83, median = 5.00

Goal 4:

Librarians are readily available by telephone or at the Library and assist clients to define questions, use resources, and develop strategies for finding answers in unfamiliar topic areas.

Focus group participants believed that real progress had been made toward achieving this goal. The shift from providing popular materials to supporting state employees' reference and research needs was also apparent.

Comments regarding progress toward this goal include:

I don't know about progress, but I think that people get help when they come in and when they telephone.

I think that we've made progress.

People coming in used to be faced with just the circulation desk. Now there's the reference desk too and it's staffed at least 6 hours per day.

We all do outreach and promotion when we're on the desk.

I've noticed that the reference interviews are far more in depth than they used to be.

We're doing more research rather than the quick answer stuff.

Grades on progress: (A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, F = 1)
4,5,5,4,4,5 - mean = 4.50, median = 4.50

Goal 5:

State employees use the department's web-site and their email software to register, request loans, photocopies, current awareness services, literature searches, and document retrieval, and to schedule training or consulting services.

Focus group participants believed that progress was being made toward achieving this goal but also felt that much work remains to be done. Most of the additional efforts suggested relate either to making state employees aware of the web-site and its resources or training state employees to use the resources effectively.

Comments and suggestions related to this goal include the following:

The pages on the LISD web-site where you can request literature search, ILL, make suggestions weren't available before. Progress has definitely been made. The web-site isn't being used a lot yet, but those who know about it are using it. The form prompts them for the information that we need to fill the request. I don't think that state employees are fully aware.

We need to do more bibliographic instruction in house for state employees.

LDD does that for state librarians; they have traveling laptops so they can set up a training lab. We could pull in people from the agencies if we had a training lab.

We could build it into new State employee orientation.

I don't know if the state employees don't know about it, or know about it and just don't use it.

That brings up another concern: with efficiencies will come numbers that we won't be able to cope with. (Concern about being overwhelmed)

A person from Billings sends a lot of interlibrary loan (ILL) requests. He sent 15 requests the first day. (There may need to be limits on the number of ILLs that can be requested at once.) There are a lot of people who do contract work for the state; we did limit them a bit, but there's no limitation on actual state employees yet.

Grades on progress: (A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, F = 1)
3,5,2,3,3,3 - mean = 3.17, median 3.00

Priorities for the future:

Focus group participants were asked to identify priorities for the future. Most felt that the current goals were worthy ones and it was generally agreed that Goals 2 and 5 need the most attention. This assessment aligns closely with the grades staff gave their performance on the various goals. Furthermore, raising awareness of the LISD's services through outreach efforts was seen as a key to overall success.

However, participants made a case for continued work on each of the five goals. Comments such as "It all goes hand-in-hand," and "it all ties together" were typical. Maintaining high quality service in the face of increased use was also a recurring topic. "We need to develop coping mechanisms to maintain quality of service. We do a pretty good job now but staff size is limited. We would need creative ways to make staff available on the floor."

When asked if there should be any new goals or alternate approaches to the current goals, the conversation turned again to better defining LISD's role in regard to service to public libraries and to the general public. "We need to include those in the goals too, or at least clarify how the goals apply to these other populations."

All agreed that communicating a change in the focus of service is difficult. State employees and the general public continue to approach the library as if it was a public library. One participant summed up the challenge by saying, "It comes down to educating one person at a time."

It was pointed out that the reorganization only started in March 2000 and that this is a relatively short period of time to achieve a wholesale change of user attitudes. Another person suggested that the goals needed to be fleshed out more, especially as they relate to user groups other than state employees. Yet another person indicated that objectives with specific target dates for achievement need to be added. "Right now I think more attention

is being paid to lofty goals than to the nitty-gritty processes of providing services." Finally, one staff member suggested that the move to the new shared automation system might require either a separate goal or a modification of one of the current goals.

Interviews

What follows are some key points and comments from the individuals interviewed.

The current goals reflect the steps that were viewed as necessary to make the LISD "the first place state employees go for information." They are a combination of enhancing the library's electronic presence and making information services available to state employees where they are (as opposed to just in the library itself). We're beyond (the upheaval of reorganization) now and are moving forward. The new team is working well together. The log of reference activity shows that more people are using the library and that there is greater variety in the types of questions that are being asked. LISD has become more effective in that it's more focused in what it does. In better defining the service populations we have been able to focus the collections better. We are making an effort to learn more about our patrons' needs, their vocabularies, etc. That information has made us better in conducting reference interviews.

LISD has made significant progress on goal one. We have a web-site now; there was nothing before. The LISD catalog is now available on the web-site. Some online databases have been added and more are planned. Collection development has been targeted. The 170 state employees who responded to the November survey are our expanded focus group and we're sending them notices and updates. LISD has been able to provide links to other agency libraries and to list their major holdings online. LISD is maintaining a log of journals being used; we're placing a heavy emphasis now on keeping data to inform future decisions.

The efforts to reach librarians has been more successful than those with state employees. Wired Montana has provided an easy method for communicating with librarians in the State. Acquisitions of professional materials for librarians are selected and purchased by LISD and are announced to the library community by LDD using a variety of methods including MLA's Wired-Montana listserv.

One missing component has been the lack of a formal marketing plan. LISD continues to be the provider of back-up reference service and of professional materials for the state's librarians. In the past the State Library was seen as a primary reference provider. LISD is now becoming the library of last resort for them instead. The goal is to get the libraries to help each other more via Wired Montana. The next step is providing librarians with more training on reference searching strategies. However, "changing the direction of the ship is hard!" The change from acting as a public library to acting like a "special" library involves a rethinking of processes and a better understanding of the context within which state employees are working. Several efficiencies that have been implemented including maintaining logs of activities using a database program and the incorporation of time frames into goals.

LISD receives less than half of the publications created by other state agencies even though the library is supposed to receive copies. Agency people need to be made aware of their responsibility in this regard

Future priorities should be training users and developing the web-site to become a more effective and widely used tool. State publications are a major challenge and opportunity. The acquisitions process needs to be more effective, including electronic as well as print publications. The physical space of the library needs to be made easier to use and we need a computer lab so staff can do tutorials with agency personnel. We also need to bring NRIS into this more.

A great deal of time and effort has recently gone into improving the quality of the library's bibliographic records in preparation for participation in the consortium. The state library's participation in the consortium sets a positive example. "It's hard to encourage other libraries to join a shared catalog if the state library doesn't participate."

LISD's change in focus toward serving the information needs of state employees has been an appropriate one. The most appropriate roles for LISD in serving public libraries are as a professional library (library science collection, staff development materials, resources for library trustees), and as a provider of the information contained in state documents. LISD also has an important role in identifying quality web-sites and making these available to libraries by providing links on the state library's web-site.

The department deserves an "A" for the effort and a "B" for the actual accomplishments as far as being known and recognized by the average state employee as a valuable information resource. Although several of the libraries (Historical and Law) are large enough to function independently, a number of the departmental libraries are small operations that either do or could look to the LISD for leadership. There should be a new goal dealing with nurturing and growing the role of LISD as the "leader library."

Two LISD users were interviewed. Both use LISD for ILL and prefer having access to things electronically, "to the desktop." One uses both NRIS and LISD resources extensively, the other often goes to the web-sites of other states to find what she needs (in her particular subject areas). Since the LISD reorganization there are more databases available online, but using some of the services is still a mystery.

The LISD staff is pretty helpful, but limited in numbers. "We need librarians to do searches for us, but usually they just tell me to do the search myself. We need a partner at the State Library finding stuff for us (anticipating needs) and letting us know when something appears. We'd like to think that the State Library 'cares' and could be part of our team." She likes e-mail communication—doesn't like having to take the time to go to the library. LISD has made some progress but "they haven't gotten there yet." "They're still stuck in developing the system. Why should I have to make out a white card for every request; why not just request online? Paper cards moving in the state mail are REALLY slow."

The Library could help with suggestions and materials to make things happen in Cabinet level initiatives. The Library could be much more—synthesize information and ship it out via email. With the State's e-mail system the Library should be able to provide access to information for state employees quickly. What the (earlier) focus group participants wanted the State Library to do is a big job and they weren't sure the State Library had the support it needed from the Governor and Legislature to do what we asked. The State Library needs to report to focus group participants about progress they've made. They were supposed to do that, but so far they haven't. "I don't really know where they're at... we do get announcements, but they should have open houses/tours for state employees."

There's been an increase in the number of useful electronic tools available through LISD. Delivery of information to the desktop is very important. Turnaround time in getting obscure resources from other libraries had improved. Information services took a big step forward when the holdings of the university libraries became available online. Awareness of LISD's services among state employees is "spotty;" most know that there is a State Library but few really understand its function.

LISD needs to do a better job of tying into the small departmental libraries in state government. The DEQ Library is an example: it's staffed by a part-time person who has very few resources other than "throwaways" from employees. At the same time, the DEQ librarian's strength is knowledge of what DEQ does and the terminology used within the field. LISD has a role to play in training departmental librarians and in coordinating the acquisition of resources in their subject areas. Departmental libraries should not be eliminated because of the unique connection that departmental librarians have to their subject area. Connecting the departmental libraries to an entity with greater staff and material resources would strengthen the level of service that departmental libraries could offer. The departmental librarian could act as the "translator/interpreter" working with the departmental staff as a personal librarian/information access trainer; LISD's role would be as the centralized resource and as the organizer of relevant information through its web presence.

APPENDIX H

NRIS Staff Focus Groups and Interviews

The Montana Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) was created in 1985 as a division of the Montana State Library and is the clearinghouse for natural resource information. Its mission is to make information on Montana's natural resources readily accessible. NRIS has three components: user services and support, GIS and Information Systems Development, and Natural Heritage Program. Its strategic plan is organized under five goal areas: data development, data delivery, outreach, working environment, and funding.

NRIS was reorganized in 2000. The consultants were asked to review the plan and structure of the department and to give a brief progress report on the achievement of the goals stated in the NRIS plan as a part of the evaluation of the Montana State Library's long-range plan. One consultant spent a day (May 10th) interviewing NRIS managers and conducting a staff focus group. A total of thirteen people spoke with the consultant.

Findings:

NRIS, as a department within a state library agency, is unique among the fifty-one state library agencies. Philosophically one can argue NRIS and libraries are in the same business, that of gathering, organizing, and disseminating information. In some ways NRIS is very similar to a special library in its subject and format focus and in the expertise its staff needs to carry out their work. As in special libraries there are different skill sets needed to serve the primary users than one ordinarily thinks of needing within a library setting. In the case of NRIS there are scientists, GIS programmers, and data coordinators as well as staff with more general technical skills. NRIS also brings a complex funding structure to the relationship with the State Library. Its budget is a mixture of state funds, "contract" work with other state agencies and with the Nature Conservancy, a private organization whose work is sometimes perceived as highly political.

With such different organizational cultures and clientele there seems no real reason to try to integrate NRIS more firmly into the Montana State Library although some staff interaction and cooperation would benefit both organizations. Both organizations currently benefit from their close structural relationship and physical proximity. From the State Library NRIS gains the perception of political and economic neutrality, which seems to be very important to the wide esteem in which NRIS is held and to the Heritage component of the department. The State Library gains from the "cutting edge" technology and the expertise of web designers in NRIS.

Overall, there seemed to be general agreement among those interviewed and those in the focus group that while progress has been made on some of the goals in the plan, it is too soon for a real assessment. The new director began in December of 2000 and, necessarily, turned his attention to the legislature and to budget issues. He has only recently been able to focus on redirecting NRIS energies. During the focus group

discussion some staff indicated they felt the reorganization was still in progress; they felt stressed by the lack of coordination among their jobs and by not knowing what the real priorities among projects ought to be. Some newer staff commented that they weren't carrying out the tasks they thought they had been hired to do. At the same time the participants seemed positive about the new director and about his abilities to move the department forward.

Focus group participants said the goals as listed were not in priority order. (Goals by subject area are 1: data development; 2: data delivery; 3: outreach; 4: working environment; and 5: funding.) Goals 1-3 are what the department does, but goal 5 was the most important, because without funding none of the others were possible. Goals 1-3 are listed in a logical process order rather than priority order. Basic things are being done under all the goals, but a sense of the department's moving forward in all areas is still lacking.

What follows is a goal by goal assessment of progress based on the comments of focus group participants and interviewees.

Goal 1 Data Development: Current clients appear satisfied in the work that is being done. Proactive identification and acquisition of new databases is lacking. Little work is being done on insuring the accuracy of data.

Goal 2 Data Delivery: Data is made accessible on the web. Knowledgeable users appear to be accessing it. Current clients appear satisfied. NRIS is perceived to be "cutting edge" in this area.

Goal 3 Outreach: None of the people with whom the consultant spoke thought NRIS had made progress in this area although all of them were quick to point out the new User Services Section head would have outreach as a major responsibility.

Goal 4 Working Environment: Morale is still suffering from the loss of staff and changes involved in the reorganization. However, the staff and the director have a mutual respect and seem to recognize what needs to happen to improve the situation.

Goal 5 Funding: Progress has been made in that the legislature approved a workable budget for the biennium. The director believes the department has two years (the biennium) to deal with issues of finding the NRIS niche and then using that information in working with the legislature.

Focus Group Discussion

Nine staff members whose tenure ranged from six months to eleven years participated in the session. They were asked about the recent NRIS reorganization and its impact on their jobs, progress that had been made on the five goals of the NRIS plan, and the challenges that remain. They were also given the opportunity to add other comments or to bring up other topics they wished to discuss.

Reorganization hasn't been completed; things are still evolving. In some ways nothing has changed. In April 2000 there was a mass exodus when restructuring was announced; staff didn't support the restructuring because it looked like a personnel plan. Job skills in different jobs didn't match what was available and no training/retraining was offered. The program overall has stabilized and work is getting done, but it doesn't feel like a reorganization. Water information used to have four people; now there's just one. The reorganization may have had good intentions, but implementation came at a time when there were human resource problems; the human resource problems have been resolved. But, there was a window, April to August of 2000 when nothing was happening at all. Now needs are being met, except perhaps in the water area. Answers to queries aren't being met as quickly as they were. There used to be four people making maps; now there are only two.

The goals look familiar, but they aren't in priority order. (Goals by subject area are 1: data development; 2: data delivery; 3: outreach; 4: working environment; and 5: funding.) You can't do goals 1-4 without funding, goal 5. NRIS didn't get a director until December of 2000 and he had to focus on the legislature (rather than the goals of the agency). The first three goals are things NRIS has done all along. Goal 3: we are doing a great job in reaching most constituencies except the general public. Well, we're doing, but it's pretty disorganized and unplanned. Things are done in reaction, not by plan. Staff wants to be more thoughtful in what we do rather than just jumping on opportunities. Most data we're developing comes from US Geological and it's not really ready for people to use. We've been looking for direction and are just now getting attention. The new director seems to be pulling people together.

Goal 4: we were told we'd all have performance appraisals by last June, but we haven't. Performance appraisals would help insure our focus. Everybody is just trying to jam lots of work in; performance appraisals would help us find a common vision. I haven't sat down with my supervisor. He has no idea what I'm working on and I have no idea if I'm on-target. We're just doing what people ask us to do. We all need a better understanding of what each other does.

Six months ago people were hired to work on goals 1-3, but we haven't been assigned goals. Implementation is what's missing. Maybe if we put more energy on goal 4, that would help performance in goals 1-3. The director needs to sit down with people and ask what their professional goals are, then they can be given assignments that meet both the agency goals and their professional goals. We're all realists; we know we don't get to work on just what we want to work on, but some recognition that there are parallel tracks here would help. We don't want to lose these guys! Staff here is highly technical and highly employable elsewhere.

With the strategic plan we hoped to tie the mission, vision and goals together, but we still don't know what the mission, vision, and goals are. What do we say to the public?

Some clients were not pleased with their contracts during reorganization. Making Jim Hill the director was seen as stability for the program. Being housed in the (state) library

is perceived as making us neutral, unbiased, and 'free.' The public is amazed at what we can do when we give demos. They have no idea of our internal problems. NRIS is really a pretty cool place. We were able to coast when seven staff left the organization because of the stellar reputation we had.

We're not doing much on "insuring accuracy" on Goal 1 (data development). We just take what's available. We lack funding for working on the accuracy. I believe our mission is to deliver data. I don't think the web is the best way, but that's what we're doing. We haven't ever had a plan to acquire data other than from the U.S. Geological Survey, maybe the highway department. Part of it's getting out of contract deliverables.

Two participants (who were fairly new hires) said they weren't doing what they were hired to do. Two others were concerned that the move to the web was making their jobs superfluous. Rules against putting names on maps you've done seem not to be shared with new people so there's an unnecessary tension when different staff are doing things differently.

A tough part of being in high tech is that it's hard to be proactive.

We used to take 30 calls for data; now we get maybe five calls. The emphasis has switched to the web. The technology staff are moving and changing things and I don't know what they're doing or how to find things. It would be nice to have more amalgamation. We need to hear where the program is going. You have to log on to the web to find out what's going on. People call and you have to go onto the web to find out what they're talking about. It's confusing. The web hasn't helped me at all. I need training. I could help other staff by referring questions (about their areas or what they like to do) if I knew what they were doing.

I find it odd that Heritage has to have a contract outside NRIS to get a map made. Heritage used to get more behind the scenes help (from NRIS). Now I don't know who to go to for things.

Those of us who work on multiple projects are unsure of priorities between projects. Whose job is it to do this? Who takes care of the administrative details? Everybody needs a den mother, but Katrina shouldn't have to do a lot of the detail work she's given. "You shoulda seen us when the printer broke down!"

I don't enjoy meetings, but the last library-wide one was before Christmas. We do need weekly briefing meetings (within NRIS) to update process stuff. I don't have a clue what LISD does. I stopped going to NRIS meetings because they became techno-dump sessions. We need to get back on regularly scheduled NRIS staff meetings until we're on the same page. Maybe library meetings monthly or bimonthly. I hate not knowing what's going on.

Heritage has weekly staff meetings. There's an agenda template. The sessions are very productive. But, in Heritage we have zero opportunity for Outreach because we're behind and it costs to take a person off a project.

All of us should be able to do outreach. But we need a shared definition of what that is. The Nature Conservancy is cool now (wasn't cool ten years ago) and has an emotional appeal to the public. NRIS could sell that appeal to the public. (Alternatively, another participant thought that might be dangerous: "NRIS can't be too much conservation because it has to be neutral.")

We need four months of funding, time when no contract work had to be done, so we could plan. There are simple coordinating things that should be done. There needs to be a single workplan, worksheet, so that all the contract work is recorded the same.

We could be a little more warm and fuzzy if we worked these things out. "Most legislators aren't geeks!" (The program needs to put on a human face, not so techie oriented that no one can understand it.)

Interviews

What follows are some key points and comments from the individuals interviewed.

There's a real need for better niche identification. Do users and funders agree with what we think we're about? We have to identify what it is we're going to do well. Once we figure out who's doing what and why we can take that to the legislature. We are a cost savings for the legislature. The clarification will be a big responsibility of the new section on outreach and education. At the same time it's important to continue as state of the art.

We're struggling with the lack of a plan on why we're pursuing particular databases, etc. We tend to be reactive; we go where the dollars are, but that's where the action is too, so it's not terribly bad. Our programmers don't have time to go looking for databases. The user's services group will have to do the planning on that. Our user base is pretty focused, but it isn't as broad as it should be. Again that's a big job for the new group. Probably the first target will be local governments and private industry. Many local governments and small private firms don't have GIS capabilities.

We're integrating the staff, meeting with the Heritage staff, forming teams with Heritage and the State library to develop a common theme on the website. In terms of rebuilding morale, we're not there yet. GIS skills are still needed; they just have to be delivered on the Internet. We've been a hands-on service bureau. We're moving in a different direction, but the hands-on won't go away.

The State Library gains a lot in terms of technology from having NRIS here. Integration at some level needs to come, perhaps knowing about each other's programs will be enough. NRIS Internet needs are totally different from the State Library.

It may be too soon to tell how reorganization is working. Since the strategic plan was developed four staff left, so it hasn't been an easy year. The reorganized structure is the right way to go. The agency does a lot of mapping contracts and that takes a real technical side. Those people prefer to write code rather than do outreach. With the new structure the split is along functional lines—separates the technical and the outreach. NRIS has three different logging request systems, which should be combined into a single approach. There are areas like that where the staff could be more efficient. NRIS is also replacing the mediated requests with Internet access, and that should also save time. People can get the answers themselves. We'll always need mediated requests, but there are lots of areas where users can do things for themselves.

Data development and delivery have always been our bread and butter. If you look at the objectives, we haven't made much progress on the goals. In the last year there has been significant progress in acquiring and deploying new data sets. The whole website infrastructure is new in last three years. But, we still have a lot to do. In 1996 it was a big deal to get a website going. Montana was the first state to get data into standardized files; today a kid could do it. NRIS should provide users with tools to do their own systems. We're integrating data into a common system.

A coordinated plan for outreach is sorely needed. We're doing a reasonable job at goal 4, working under lots of pay constraints. This section is made up of programmer-analysts who could make two to three times as much money in the private sector. So—we try to offer an open working environment; try to provide some training and conference support and cutting edge equipment. We need to get away from contacts with source agencies because that puts us in five other agencies' budgets.

Goal 3 (outreach) will need the most attention next year. Having a new section leader who will plan will help. Next after that would be Goal 2 (delivery). We have new tools, but they need integration. NRIS has an IMLS grant of \$238,00 over two years to develop a demonstration model.

Heritage had done its own strategic plan, aside from NRIS. Sometimes a financial crisis is a blessing in disguise; it lets you do things you know need to be done. Heritage here has a staff of about 13 people; 65-70% of the staff are scientists—botany, zoology, and ecology—who develop the databases. The rest of the staff are in data management, either systems or services, who maintain the databases and disseminate the information. At some point the Nature Conservancy will want real integration of the program with their host, to go from being a contract to being a part of state government, but that isn't a priority right now.

Integration and coordination are challenges. People don't know how to relate to us in their midst because we have different procedures, pay periods, etc. The budgeting and financial management for Heritage is all separate. The credibility issue is also a challenge. The Conservancy tries to keep Heritage at arms length (for its own protection).

Half of the Heritage budget is money that comes through grants and cost sharing projects. The managers within the department are also responsible for fund raising and program development. The staff are “strong people.” They’re currently revising their strategic plan. They also communicate a lot with their project partners, ask for a lot of input, ask questions like, What are your organization’s priorities? What will be your information needs over the next couple of years?

Heritage should build a better relationship/partnership with the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks over the next few years. They’re “fundamental to our health.”

Fish and Wildlife has had a long relationship with NRIS. NRIS had capabilities Fish and Wildlife didn’t have. Fish and Wildlife is a core agency funding NRIS; provides \$115,000 each biennium for core services. There are no down sides to the relationships and location at all. Their program (Heritage and NRIS) wouldn’t be as advanced if Fish and Wildlife weren’t here. We help NRIS and Heritage on some things and use everybody on their staffs at some level. Fish and Wildlife has two contracts with Heritage on web development and two with NRIS, one on core services and one to do a GIS program and map requests. “Montana is cutting edge because of NRIS.”

The NRIS Advisory Council reviewed and commented on the strategic plan and was involved with some of the reorganization. The NRIS director looks to the Advisory Council for policy direction. Reorganization needed to occur; there were lots of issues at the time. Legislators are always impressed with the NRIS staff and with the information they (the legislators) receive. There was lots going on, but it didn’t impact the quality of the information we received. Now NRIS has become stronger. They (NRIS) invite legislators over and get good interaction with them; provide mock up; get legislators involved in tailoring products to their clientele or constituency needs. NRIS is a unique group; their information is heavily used in policy studies. Having it attached to the State Library is good for its nonpartisan image, but it doesn’t really fit there.

The (current) study recommendations should include support for a better funding structure. There needs to be state funding, a general fund authorization. The State Librarian and the NRIS director could be doing better things than working on budgeting all the time.

Beyond the Advisory Council of users there’s a constituency of users in Montana to help the program financially and politically. It would be helpful to expand their base and to get more exposure of NRIS to people who could use the information. The Heritage Program and NRIS are separate, but need to be integrated more. There are political issues; sometimes Heritage is under fire. They have to work the relationship out more—cooperate, but maintain their own identities. Heritage programs are sometimes targeted by conservatives in legislature. If they were more proactive, they could build some defenses, but for the most part they work well together.